

Series, No. 39, Vol. X.]

[Published Quarter

# THE LIBRARY

EDITED BY  
J. W. MACALISTER  
F.S.A.



# THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION was founded in 1877, and in 1928 received a Royal Charter in recognition of the value of its public work. The membership of the Association is not confined to Librarians. Its main objects are to unite all persons engaged or interested in Library Administration or in Bibliographical Research. For this purpose it has instituted classes in Librarianship and Bibliography, holds examinations in the above subjects, and issues certificates which are now recognised as essential qualifications for appointments as Library Assistants or Librarians. The annual subscription is one guinea, in return for which the Member receives the monthly organ of the Association, is entitled to the free use of the lending library maintained by the Association, and to attend its monthly and annual meetings. For membership forms apply to

MRS. REILLY, 24, Whitcomb Street, W.C.

## THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION RECORD.

### CONTENTS OF MAY NUMBER, 1900.

#### CURRENT VIEWS.

BOOK-PLATES: their Beauty and Utility. By CHARLES F. NEWCOMBE.

SOME TENTATIVE PROPOSALS FOR THE COMPILATION OF A CATALOGUE OF BEST BOOKS. By F. J. PERLOW.

CONCERNING THE LIBRARY ASSISTANT. By ERNEST BAILEY.

PROFESSIONAL PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

#### NOTES AND NEWS:

BENEFACCTIONS—NEW BUILDINGS—MISCELLANEOUS.

#### APPOINTMENTS.

ABSTRACT OF LIBRARY REPORTS.

LIBRARY ASSOCIATION: PROCEEDINGS AND OFFICIAL NOTICES:

FEBRUARY MEETING—NORTHERN COUNTIES LIBRARY ASSOCIATION—PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATION, 1900.

NOTES AND QUERIES ON PUBLIC LIBRARY LAW.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

## MESSRS. ELLIS

Dealers in OLD and RARE BOOKS, MANUSCRIPTS and ENGRAVINGS  
29, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

(Business established by John Brindley in 1728)

LIBRARIES arranged and catalogued; large or small collections of old Books purchased; Rare Books and Prints searched for and reported; SALES BY AUCTION attended and commissions carefully executed; all descriptions of BOOK-BINDING and repairs to old books undertaken and carried out by the most skilful craftsmen; London Agents for the VELLUCENT Bindings of Messrs. Cedric Chivers, of Bath; Sole British Agents for the facsimile reproductions of these two famous MSS. the BREVARIUM GRIMANI, of Venice, and the HORTULUS ANIMÆ, of Vienna; CATALOGUES of new purchases issued periodically; inspection of the stock invited.

### WORKS BY THE LATE JOHN DAVIDSON

Self's the Man: a Tragi-Comedy. Crown 8vo, cloth. 5/- net.  
Testaments:—  
1. The Testament of a Vivisector. Fcap. 4to. Sewed. 6d. net.  
2. The Testament of a Man Forbid. Fcap. 4to. Sewed. 6d. net.  
3. The Testament of an Empire-Builders. Fcap. 4to. Sewed. 1/- net.  
4. The Testament of a Prime Minister. Impl. 16mo, buckram. 3/6 net.  
A Queen's Romance. Imperial 16mo, buckram. 3/6 net.  
The Knight of the Maypole. Imperial 16mo, paper boards. 5/- net.  
A Rosary. Imperial 16mo, buckram. 5/- net.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING LTD. LONDON W

er  
19  
4  
25  
7  
10  
5

A


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100





## THE LIBRARY.

A NEW TRACT FROM THE MAR-  
PRELATE PRESS.

HE 'Athenæum' for 6th February last contains a short description of the valuable library of manuscripts and books given by Sir John Williams to form the basis of the National Library of Wales, recently founded at Aberystwyth. In this description mention is made of 'rare tracts by John Penry.' Sir John Williams was kind enough to provide me with a list of these last summer. They are seven in number, being:

- i. An Exhortation . . . 1588. 110 pp.
- ii. An Exhortation . . . 1588. 65 pp.
- iii. A viewe (generally known as 'The Supplication').
- iv. Th' Appellation . . . 1589.
- v. A Treatise wherein . . . 1590.
- vi. An Humble motion . . . 1590.
- vii. A briefe discovery . . . D. Bancroft . . .

Copies of all except the first may be found in the British Museum, in the University Library of Cambridge, or at Lambeth; and we have no reason for thinking that the Welsh copies differ from

those to be seen elsewhere. With No. i., however, things are different. It is as far as I know a unique tract, it has never previously been described in full,<sup>1</sup> it contains some remarkable and hitherto unpublished information about early printing in Wales, and finally it adds one more to the list of pamphlets printed by Waldegrave on the Marprelate press. In short it is of first-class interest to bibliographers, and having been enabled to examine it last summer by the courtesy of Sir John Williams, I will now endeavour to describe it as fully as possible.

First, let us see how it stands with regard to other editions of Penry's 'Exhortation.' The first edition was printed by Waldegrave early in 1588, upon the same press and in the same type as Udall's 'Diotrephes' (first edition), which press and type were seized by the officers of the Stationers' Company on 16th April, and subsequently destroyed. This edition is quoted on p. 28 of 'A Godly Treatise,' by one Dr. Some, who signs his preface '6 Maij 1588.' This date gives us the clue to the date of Sir John Williams' unique 'Exhortation,' on p. 110 of which occur the words, 'TO THE READER. Master D. SOMES booke was published this day, I have read it.' . . . We may safely assume, therefore, that the tract we are describing passed through the press in the first or second week of May, 1588. There is, however, another issue of

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Williams first drew attention to its existence in a short letter published in the 'Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society,' October, 1906. This was pointed out to me by Mr. William Pierce, and so I came to a knowledge of the tract.

'An Exhortation' (No. ii. in Sir John Williams' list) to be reckoned with, a copy of which is to be seen in the British Museum (702. a. 39). It has only 65 pages, and on the last page we have an address 'to the Reader,' as before, but this time beginning with the words, 'I haue read Master D. Some's book,' from which we may conclude that it was issued later than the Williams copy, No. i. The type in which the first edition was printed had been destroyed, and though Waldegrave still had some type from the same fount, which he used for his second edition of 'Diotrephes,' and other pamphlets, he elected to print the second edition of 'An Exhortation' in the 'litle Romaine and Italian letter,' of which we hear so much in the story of the Marprelate press. No. i. of our list and the British Museum copy are both printed in this type. The similarity, however, does not end here. I examined Sir John Williams' copy at the University Library, Cambridge, and took minute notes of it, including every catch-word and marginal note. These notes I subsequently took to London, and compared with the British Museum copy. The conclusion I came to was that for the first 64 pages the two issues were identical. Every catch-word tallied, and the marginal notes corresponded even down to the mistakes in certain numerals. It is sufficient here to refer to the title-page in order to leave no doubt whatever upon the point. Thus runs the title of the unique copy:—

An exhortation vnto the gouer-/nours, and people of  
hir Maiesties/countrie of Wales, to labour earnestly,/to  
haue the preaching of/the Gospell planted a-/mong

them.//There is in the ende something/that was not in the former/impression.//PSAL. 137. 5, 6./If I shall forget thee, o Ierusalem, let my right hande/forget her selfe, if I do not remember, thee, let my toong/cleauue vnto the rooffe of my mouth: yea, if I prefer not/Ierusalem vnto my cheefe loye.//2. COR. 1. 13./For wee write no other thing vnto you, than that you/reade, or that you acknowledge, and I trust you shal ac-/knowledge vnto the ende.//1 COR. 5. 13, 14./For, whether we be out of our wit, we are it vnto God,/or whether wee be in our right mind, wee are it vnto you./For, that loue of Christ doth constraine vs.//1588.//

Compare this with the title-page of the British Museum copy, and it will be found to reproduce it faithfully, including the misplaced comma between 'remember' and 'thee.' It may be added that the last lines of each paragraph correspond throughout, and that both issues have a slipped letter 'i' eight lines from the bottom of p. 41. The divergence begins on p. 65, which is the last page of the British Museum copy, and it is evident that for some reason pp. 65-110 were omitted in the later issue, thus necessitating the reprinting of p. 65, which in the British Museum copy is quite obviously an insertion. The title-page it will be seen announces that 'there is in the ende something that was not in the former impression' (*i.e.*, in the first edition). This refers to the extra matter from p. 41 onwards, which is to be found in both the later issues. But our unique copy has yet a third division, which commences on p. 65, and thus comprises the matter which was excluded in the latest issue. This is headed 'TO THE LL. OF

THE COVNSSEL,' and begins at the point where the address 'To the Reader' begins in the other issue.

Before describing the contents of this hitherto unknown writing of Penry, we may sum up our bibliographical description of the whole book in the usual collation formula:—

A—O<sub>4</sub>; pp. (2) + 110. Description: (A<sub>1</sub>) Title. (A<sub>2</sub>) Dedication (11 lines), line 11, 'from my soule.' Text. (F<sub>2a</sub>) *Begins* 'Thus I haue set downe,' etc. (I<sub>2a</sub>) To the LL. of the Counsel. (O<sub>4b</sub>) 'To the Reader, Master D. Somes booke was published this day,' etc.<sup>1</sup>

'To the LL. of the Covnsel' is, like nearly all Penry's works, an address to the authorities on behalf of his native country Wales, the spiritual destitution of which filled his soul with horror and despair. His language is as usual bold. Sin, he declares, is detestable even in Privy Councillors, and he proceeds to show that the Privy Council in its neglect of the spiritual needs of Wales is not only guilty of great sin, but is in danger of falling under the wrath of God. In a fine passage he points to the great Armada, just at that time preparing to leave Spain, as the possible instrument of the anger of the Almighty. 'It is not therefore the Spanishe furniture and preparations: but the sinners within the land, that we are most of all to feare. For although the armie of the Spanyarde were consumed with the arrowes of famine: although the contagious, and deuouring pestilence had eaten them vp by thousands; although their

<sup>1</sup> I transcribe this from a note of the tract made by Mr. Sayle while it was at the University Library, Cambridge.

tottering shippes were despersed and carried away with the whirlewinde and tempest; although madnes & astonishment were amongst them, from him that sitteth in the throne, vnto her that grindeth in the mil: although the lords reuenging sword in the hand of the sauage Turke had so preuailed against them, as it had left none in that uncircumcised host but langwishing and foyled men, notwithstandinge a contēptible & withered remnant of the plague & famine: a nauie of winde and weather-shaken ships: a refuse of feeble and discomforted men, shalbe sufficiently able to preuaile against this land, vnlesse another course be taken for Gods glory in Wales by your HL, then hitherto hath bene.<sup>1</sup> This is not the only reference to the Armada in Penry's writings. He constantly returns to it, and always in the same exalted, impassioned strain. Prose like this is not common at such an early period.

Another passage gives us an example of Penry's style in a different vein. A very large portion of the address to the Privy Council is taken up with an attack upon 'A Defence of the Gouernment Established in the Church of Englande for Ecclesiasticall Matters,' by John Bridges, Dean of Salisbury. This, it will be remembered, was the book against which Martin Marprelate first directed the shaft of his wit. It is, therefore, extremely interesting to see what Penry has to say about it. He begins by accusing Bridges of 'going about, for the defence of his bellye and the bellies of the rest

<sup>1</sup> Pages 105, 106.



of his coate, to ouerthrowe her Maiesties title of Soueraigne preheminance.' He asserts that Bridges' argument in favour of episcopacy is identical with that of Bellarmine in favour of popery, and further that Bridges has placed himself 'directly within the compasse of treason.' Finally, after pronouncing the Dean's book a 'a popish quilt,' he dismisses the subject in the following words: 'As for D. Bridges himselfe his vnsauery and vnlearned stile, his popishe reasons, long since banished out of the schooles of all sound deuines, hys whole booke, his ungodly and abhominable praier that the preaching of the word may neuer bee had generally throughout the land, his scripture being the subscription of the second epistle to Timothie, his alleadging of writers, as clear against himselfe as blacke is to white as of Augustine, Caluin, Aretius, &c, his imperfect peroides without sence or sauour, his Bishop James, Archbishops Tim, and Titus,<sup>1</sup> his translation of *vos autem nolite vocari rabbi*, into will not you bee called rabbi, with thousand other monumens of his prophane impiety, sottish ignorance, and want of learning, euidently conuince, that he was neuer as yet in Platonis Politie, where any good learning grewe, but hath wallowed himself all his life, in Romuli fece, whence learning hath ben long since banished & godlines neuer shone. . . . For to omit, that in 160. sheets of paper, he hath don nothing but ouerthrown himselfe vtterly shamed his whoorishe cause, by shewing the nakednes thereof, translated other mens writ-

<sup>1</sup> This is obviously the origin of Martin's practice of speaking of the saints as 'Sir,' cf. 'Hay any worke' (Petheram ed., p. 17).

ings, taught the reader how to vnderstand the learned discourse, and added marginall notes, so that if other men had neuer written, he would have said nothing, this shalbe found vndoubtedly true throughout the whole booke, that he hath made a couenant before hand, not to dispute, vnlesse you grant conclusion & all, and rather flatlie to be non plus then prooue anything.'<sup>1</sup> Nearly all the points against Bridges here noticed are also to be found in Martin's 'Epistle' and 'Epitome.' The resemblance, in fact, between the tracts is so striking as to leave no doubt whatever upon my mind that there was a close connection between them. It is possible that Penry himself wrote the whole or part of the Martinist tracts. I think it more likely, however, that they were the work of another person writing with Penry's tract before his eyes.<sup>2</sup> The points are reproduced, but in a different style. In any case, here is the basis of the anti-Bridges portion of the 'Epistle' and 'Epitome.' The date, therefore, of the second edition of Penry's 'Exhortation,' a little after 6th May, gives us a clue to the period at which the first two Marprelate tracts were either begun or first thought of. We must suppose that the address, 'To the LL. of the Counsel' was suppressed, perhaps in order that it might be worked up into another and more lively

<sup>1</sup> Pages 87-8.

<sup>2</sup> There is a third alternative, viz., that Penry and 'Martin' wrote independently of each other, but used the same notes. Since writing the above I have come to feel that this is probably the true explanation of the similarity.

form, and certainly in order to prevent the connection between Penry and Martin being too obvious to the eyes of the authorities.

The third passage I wish to quote from this interesting tract is of more general bibliographical interest. It refers to the secret printing of a 'popish book' in Wales, and is, I believe, one of the earliest notices of Welsh printing that we possess. It was, of course, unknown to Herbert, but I think that the passage from 'The Epistle' which he notes concerning that 'knaue Thackwell the printer which printed popishe and trayterous welshe bookes in wales,'<sup>1</sup> probably refers to the same incident. If so it is but another proof of the close connection between this tract of Penry's and the first two Marprelate pamphlets. 'It is now,' writes Penry, 'ful 29. yeares and upward, since Babilon [*i.e.*, Catholicism] hath bin ouerthrown in Wales. . . . But alas what shall we and our posteritie be the better for this if Syon bee not built. . . . Nowe for the space of 28. yeares, no man greatly labored to hir maiesty, the Parliament, your Hh. or to the people themselues, either by speaking or writing in the behalfe of either of these vnreconcilable cities.'<sup>2</sup> . . . The last yeare, as I am almost pesuaded, the verye same day, or by all likely-hood the very same week: vpon a suddain, the enterprises of the building of both, in 2 seuerall books, issuing from two of the remotest corners in

<sup>1</sup> 'Epistle' (ed. Arber), p. 22. Typ. Ant., iii., p. 1466. Cf. also Cooper's 'Admonition' (ed. Arber), p. 34, 'Hay any Worke,' (ed. Petheram), p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> cf. 'The Acquity,' p. 27 (ed. Grieve, p. 25).

our lande (South-wales and North-wales) was taken in hand. The one of the bookes pleading the cause of Sion, cōming forth priuiledged by publike authority, & alowāce, was directed unto hir maiesty & the Parliament, requiring at their hands, by vertue of the lords own mandatory letters, the performance of this work, shewing by euidence or greatest antiquity, this to bee required of duety at their handes, as a part of the homage due vnto his highnes whose feudaries and vassalles, all the princes & states vnter heauen must acknowledge themselues to be & a portion of that inheritance, beeing theirs by liniall discent from their predecessors, the godly kings and rulers, who time out of mind, alwaies laied their shulders vnto this burthen. The other written in Welch [marginal note, 'Y druch Christi anogaw'] printed in an obscure caue in North-wales, published by an author vnknown, & more vnlearned, (for I thinke hee had neuer read anything but the common published resolution of R. P. a book containing many substantiall errors, frier Rush, and other shameful fables) stood to by none, & hauing no reasons to shew why his Babilon should be reaedified, it contained it selfe within the handes of a few simple priuate men and neuer durst vnto thys hour be made known vnto you HL. Both the bookes in this thinge had the same successe, in that both together they fel into the hands of the prelats, who as they pretend are enemies vnto both places, but vndoubtedly vnto Syon, especially as it appeared by their harde dealing with the patron of that cause, whereas the fautors of the other, were either not

at all dealt with, or very curteously entertained of thē.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. William Pierce tells me in a letter upon this subject that the title of the Welsh tract should be 'Y druch Christianogawl,' which is in modern Welsh 'Y drych Christianogol,' and in English 'The Christian Mirror.' The other book printed in Wales in 1587 was perhaps, as Penry's words seem to imply, an edition of his 'Aequity,' printed for Welsh readers.<sup>2</sup>

I cannot conclude my remarks upon this important discovery in the Marprelate field of bibliography without pointing out that it will make necessary a reconsideration of some accepted theories about the early history of the Marprelate press. The tract, as has been said, is printed in the well known 'litle Romaine and Italian letter,' and it appeared almost immediately after 6th May, 1588. Now it is generally assumed that this type was lying at the time in the house of Mistress Crane, in Aldermanbury, London. Nicholas Tomkins, Mistress Crane's servant, confessed at an examination which took place in February, 1589 (*v.* Arber, 'Introd. Sketch to Martin Marprelate Controversy,' p. 84) that when 'Waldegrave's press was marred,' the puritan printer brought a Case of Lettres' to Mistress Crane's house, and that it remained there for 'a Month together.' At a later examination (Arber, p. 86), when he was evidently questioned much more carefully, he declared that Waldegrave

<sup>1</sup> Pages 99-101.

<sup>2</sup> The imprint of the only edition of 'The Aequity' now known reads, 'At Oxford,' Printed by Ioseph Barnes. 1587.'

*and his wife* brought the type, and that it 'remained there about 3 Months,' that is, comments Professor Arber, from May to July, 1588. Waldegrave's press was 'marred' on 13th May, 1588 (*v. Herbert*, 'Typ. Ant.,' ii., 1145, ed. 1786), but the raid had been made upon his house, and his press, 'with twoo paire of cases, with certaine Pica Romane, and Pica Italian letters,' had been seized a month before, on 16th April. Now we may fairly assume that he began to print Penry's 'Exhortation' (2nd edition) between these two dates, seeing that it was upon the eve of publication when Some's book, dated 6th May, appeared. Some help may be obtained by supposing that Tomkins made the mistake of imagining that the raid and the destruction of the press and type took place at the same time. This would give us another month and allow us to suppose that the type was brought to Mistress Crane's on 16th April, a much more natural supposition than the former. Nor need we insist too precisely upon the 'three months.' Tomkins, in his first examination, thinks that the type remained there for 'a month together,' while Baker, the copyist of the second examination, complains that 'this paper was wrote in so wretched a hand that it is hardly possible to give a true and perfect copy,' so what he gives as three may possibly have been meant for two. Let us give ourselves as long a rope as possible then. Let us admit that the type appeared at Mistress Crane's on 16th April, and remained there for two months, or even (for why not go the whole length while we are about it?) for only one month. Have



we really escaped our difficulty? No: do what we will, there stands John Penry in our path with his clear and unmistakable statement, 'Master D. Somes booke was published this day.' There is no help for it. Waldegrave must have been setting up the 'Exhortation' in the 'litle Romaine and Italian letter' at the end of April or, at the very latest, in the first week of May. And yet there was the same type lying unused at Aldermanbury. Obviously there is no road in this direction.<sup>1</sup>

The mistake which has led us all astray hitherto, has been the identification of the rescued type with this small roman and italic. It is a mistake which goes back to the sixteenth century, for the whole theory of this identification rests upon a statement in a document among the 'Lansdowne MS.' (61. Art. 22.) which Professor Arber entitles, 'A summary of the information in the hands of the Queen's Government as to the Martinists on the 22nd September, 1589.' 'Touching the printing of the two last Libells [*i.e. Martin Junior and Martin Senior*] in a litle Romaine and Italian letter,' the author of the paper remarks, 'when his [Waldegrave's] other letters and presse were defaced about Easter was twelve moneth he saved these lettres in a boxe under his cloke and brought them to Mistris Cranes howse in London, as is also confessed' (Arber, p. 115). This is our sole authority for imagining that the type which Waldegrave and

<sup>1</sup> If we follow Tomkins literally, and date the leaving of the type at Mistress Crane's on 13th May, matters are no better, since we have still to account for the third edition of the 'Exhortation' printed in the same type.

his wife saved from the raid was the small roman and italic. We do not know who the writer is, but it is not difficult to see that he knows very little indeed about the first phase of the Marprelate enterprise. The document is founded for the most part upon an examination of Sharpe, the bookbinder of Northampton, which has since been lost, but which was clearly much more meagre than the full confession he made on 15th October, 1589. In any case, Sharpe knew nothing of the Marprelate press before it migrated into his neighbourhood. The statement above quoted is based, as far as we can tell, entirely upon Tomkin's *first* examination, and the identification of these types we must suppose to have been a mere guess on the part of this unknown writer. He was evidently some ecclesiastic or official (I suspect, without any positive grounds for so doing, that it may have been Matthew Sutcliffe), who was fond of a theory, as indeed we all are. We can but curse him for a meddling fool, however, for he has hitherto led astray all those who have followed him in the great Martin hunt.

What, then, is the real explanation of this tangle? It is that the type which Waldegrave rescued, was from the same case as the roman and italic *pica* which was destroyed on 13th May. The Stationers' Records speak, it will be remembered, of 'certain letters.' Is it straining a point to detect a touch of disappointment in this use of the word 'certain'? The officials had expected at least to find a complete case, but apparently they only found a small quantity. Waldegrave certainly contrived to use


type similar to that in which the first editions of 'Diotrephes' and the 'Exhortation' were printed, all the time he was engaged as Marprelate printer, and the same type reappears in some of his books printed later in Scotland. What is remarkable about this type is its small quantity. It is defective in every way, and its poverty is especially noticeable in the matter of stops. This would be naturally accounted for on the theory that in the hurry of the moment, with the Stationers' officials coming down the street, Waldegrave had only time to shovel part of the type into a case and make off, assisted by his wife, through some back entrance to Mistress Crane's house. Last summer in conversation with me upon this matter of the flight with the type, Mr. W. W. Greg expressed himself incredulous as to the truth of the story, because he thought it impossible for one man, even with another's assistance, to carry away under his cloak such a heavy weight as the small roman and italic must have been. My present reading of the incident avoids this difficulty, but Mr. Greg's comment suggests a second and probably more important reason than mere haste for the poverty of the pica type. Waldegrave may have had some hours warning of the intended raid, but if so this would be only just sufficient time to allow him and his wife to go once from his house to Mistress Crane's. They would of course carry all that they could upon this single journey, but we can see from the second edition of 'Diotrephes,' 'The Protestation,' and other tracts printed in this type, that they could not have carried away much

more than half a caseful, if indeed as much as that.

A good deal turns upon this question of the whereabouts of the two main roman founts of Marprelate type at the beginning of 1588, as I hope to show on some other occasion. Enough, however, has here been said to prove the importance of this new tract (for so it virtually is) from the hand of Penry, and to show us how thick beset 'with pitfall and with gin' this old Marprelate battlefield is, even to the wariest investigator. One must keep one's head clear, and walk like Agag. But all this only makes the adventure the more exciting. I wonder if there is any other bibliographical topic which thrills and intoxicates like the history of the Marprelate press.

JOHN DOVER WILSON.

## HENRY DENHAM, PRINTER.

T the time when Richard Tottell was passing through his press that collection of English verse known as 'Tottell's Miscellany,' he had in his employ an apprentice named Henry Denham, who took up his freedom in the Company of Stationers on the 30th August, 1560. Denham is next found in 1564 in possession of a printing house of his own in White Cross Street, Cripplegate, which may have been the premises previously in the occupation of Richard Harrison. He remained there but a very short time, as in 1565 he is found in Paternoster Row, at the sign of the Star, which he continued to occupy until the latter end of his life.

Henry Denham belongs to an interesting period in the history of English printing. For an all too brief period, dating from about 1557, there was a kind of typographical awakening in England, of which the leaders were Archbishop Parker, and John Day, the printer. A determined attempt was made to instil some artistic life into the trade by the introduction of good founts of type, handsome initial letters, and general excellence of work. As we have shown in a previous article, John Day was ably seconded by Henry Bynneman, and Henry Denham, with whom we are now concerned, must

X.

R

be reckoned a good third, if he does not tie with Bynneman for second place.

Denham's office was furnished with a large and varied assortment of letter, from nonpareil to great primer, and all of it was good. His blacks, in particular, are noticeable for their clearness and beauty, while his nonpareil and other small sizes are remarkable for their regularity. But the good appearance of Denham's types is largely due to the care and neatness of his presswork. In this respect he was even superior to Bynneman, freedom from dirty type or over inking being a distinct feature of his books.

Denham also had a varied stock of initial letters, ornaments and borders, many of which were extremely good. Pride of place must be given to the set of large woodcut initials known as the A. S. series, and attributed to Anton Sylvius, an Antwerp engraver. These letters are first found in use by Thomas Berthelet, the king's printer, as early as 1546. They then appear to have passed into the hands of Jugge and Cawood, who used them largely in printing proclamations. How they came into the possession of Henry Denham is not quite clear, as Cawood was still printing when they are first found in Denham's books.

These initials which represent classical or mythological subjects, show an artistic spirit and grace of treatment that had not been seen in England before their appearance and was never equalled. Day attempted to imitate them in Cunningham's 'Cosmographicall Glasse,' but without much success. Denham also possessed duplicates of some of the



letters, recut from the original set, but these are easily distinguishable by the hardness of the lines, omission of details, and crude cutting.

Denham also was one of the six printers who used, in originals or copies, another set of large woodcut initial letters, which I described in my paper on Henry Bynneman, the similarity in size and design being so close, that only actual comparison can detect the difference. But in addition to these, Denham had a large stock of woodcut initials of smaller sizes, about which a chapter might very well be written. Mr. Sayle in his admirable paper on the subject of 'Initial Letters in Early English Printed Books,' read before the Bibliographical Society of London, on the 17th November, 1902, and printed in the seventh volume of the Society's Transactions, speaking of one of these sets, says: 'It is quite unlike any other work in England, and, further, it is not used anywhere abroad. I place it as high as the work of Sylvius, if not, indeed, in some respects still higher.' This praise is not exaggerated. It might also be applied to the graceful little letters that adorn the pages of the 'Monument of Matrones,' which is perhaps the finest all-round example of Denham's work that is to be found.

Many of Denham's title-pages were enclosed in a frame of printers' ornaments with good effect, while others had elaborate woodcut borders, either especially engraved for the work, or obtained from other printers.

Thus equipped Denham began business some time in 1564, his first book entry, a sermon by the

Rev. Thomas Cole, being registered during the year ending 22nd July, 1564 (Arber, i., 237). Before the end of that year he also printed for Lucas Harrison, of the Crane in St. Paul's Churchyard, Theodore de Bèze's 'Life and Death of Master John Calvin,' and 'A Pleasant dialogue or disputation between the Cap and the Head,' of which there is a copy at Lambeth; while for John Charlewood he provided an octavo called 'The Treasure of Gladnesse.' These were, presumably, all of them printed at the White Cross Street premises. During the year 1566 Denham's press was very busy, no less than fifteen works being traced to it, including Pierre Boaistuau's 'Theatrum Mundi, or Rule of the world,' notable as containing some of Edward Spenser's earliest verse; Robert Crowley's 'Apology or Defence,' which Denham appears to have shared with Henry Bynneman; William Painter's first volume of the 'Palace of Pleasure'; translations from the works of Pliny and Seneca; a volume of poems by Thomas Howell, called 'The Arbor of Amity'; two romances by Thomas Partridge, 'The notable history of Astianax and Polixena,' and 'The worthy History of the knight Plasidas,' and Anthony Rush's 'President for a Prince.' This last mentioned book is particularly noticeable, as being in an entirely different fount of black letter to any which is found in Denham's other books.

In 1569 we come upon Henry Denham's first folio, Richard Grafton's 'Chronicle at Large,' in two volumes, which he printed for Richard Tottell and Humphrey Toy. The work was dedicated to

the Secretary of State, Sir William Cecill, and the initial letter to the dedication has the arms of Cecill. The border to the title-page of the first volume was one of Richard Tottell's, an extremely ugly one, containing the supposed portraits of the various kings and queens; but that to the second volume was one of Grafton's, and is one of those signed A. S., no doubt the work of the engraver or the initial letters bearing the same signature. As may readily be believed it was a striking contrast to that of the earlier volume. The text was printed in black letter, and several of the A. S. initials were used in it. On the verso of the last leaf is Grafton's large device.

Another interesting folio that appeared in 1574 was John Baret's 'An Alvearie or Triple Dictionary in English, Latin, and French.' The border to this title-page was specially cut for the work. It is an elaborate design, partly conventional, partly architectural, and partly pictorial; in the bottom panel is a beehive, and above this the crest of Sir William Cecill, to whom the book was dedicated, while in the lower corners are the letters H. D. This dictionary is printed with great care, a great variety of types being used in it, and the presswork is excellent.

About this time (the exact date is unknown) Denham acquired the patent of William Seres for printing the Psalter, the Primer for little children, and all books of private prayer whatsoever in Latin and English. By virtue of this he also printed parts of the Book of Common Prayer. Strype, to whom we are indebted for the account of Denham's

acquisition of this patent, says that Denham took seven young men, free of the Company of Stationers, to help him work it, and that it gave rise to a great case, meaning a case in the courts of law. When or where that case was tried, has not been found, but from the fact of Denham's engaging seven freemen to help him, it is evident that there must have been a large output under this patent. As regards the Psalter and the Primer, very few copies printed by Denham are in existence. The British Museum possesses three, two being editions of the Psalms, one in Latin and one in English, neither of which calls for comment, and the third an imperfect edition of the Psalter, in octavo, noticeable for the border printed in red and black, and containing Henry Denham's rebus on either side, with figures of Ceres, etc. The work is preceded by a calendar, each month having a small woodcut illustrating its principal occupations. But the most important part of the patent seems to have been the printing of books of private prayers, and of these many examples can be found, and some of them are worth notice. In 1574 was issued Thomas Twynne's 'Garlande of godlie flowers,' a diminutive little volume measuring three inches by two and a half. It was dedicated to Sir Nicholas Bacon and his wife the Lady Anne. The pages are surrounded by narrow woodcut borders, some of an interlaced design, others geometrical, the former being the better of the two. The little volume is further illustrated with a cut of the arms of Sir Nicholas Bacon; the arms of Thomas Twynne; and on the verso of the last leaf, the

large device of Henry Denham. Equally good is Thomas Roger's edition of 'The Imitatio Christi,' published in 1580, printed throughout in nonpareil and brevier, with good little woodcut initials. In 1581, we have Abraham Fleming's 'Footpath of Felicitie,' each page of which is surrounded by the geometrical border seen in the 'Garlande of godlie flowers.' 'The Monomachie of Motives or a Battell between Vertues and vices' was another of these dainty little volumes, compiled by Abraham Fleming. This title is surrounded by a graceful border, containing the rose, fleur-de-lys, and portcullis, the emblems of the Tudors. It is further adorned with the arms of Sir George Carey, to whom it was dedicated.

But the largest and best of these collections of private prayers was that printed and published by Henry Denham in 1582, under the title of 'The Monument of Matrones, containing seven severall Lamps of Virginitie, or distinct treatises; whereof the first five concern praier and meditation, the other two last precepts and examples' . . .

The editor of this compilation was Thomas Bentley, of Grays Inn, and the work contained prayers written by many noble ladies. The last two parts of the work did not come from Denham's press, and were of very inferior workmanship, but the first five 'lamps,' as they were called, represent the high-water mark of excellence in Denham's printing. Each of the lamps has a separate title-page, for which a special border was cut, no two of them being alike. It is no exaggeration to say that these borders of Denham's are both artistic and

graceful. The first has embodied in the design, at the top, the royal arms; the sides are occupied with illustrations from the Scriptures, the arms of the city of London and the Stationers' Company, and the footpiece has the initials of Denham. The second and third titles have portraits of various queens and noble ladies, and are, if possible, even more delicate in treatment, and if by comparison the fourth and fifth seem poorer in design, there is at least no falling off in their execution. There is no clue to the engraver of these borders, but his hand can be traced in several others found in books of this period.

Another class of works, several of which came through Denham's press, is formed by books on country life. In 1574, Reginald Scot, a native of Kent, wrote and published a useful treatise on the growing of hops, which he called the 'Perfite plat-forme of a Hoppe garden.' It was printed in quarto, by Denham, with his usual care, and at once became popular, a second edition being called for in 1576, and another in 1578. Scot was also the author of a much more famous work, 'The discoverie of witchcraft.' Not less valuable was Leonard Mascall's 'Booke of the Arte and maner how to plant and graffe all sortes of trees,' the first edition of which Denham also printed in quarto for John Wight, about 1572, subsequent editions being called for in 1575, 1580, 1582, and 1592.

Books on horsemanship and the care of horses, by Thomas Blundeville, in 1580, by John Astley, in 1584, and by John Corte in 1584, each of them in quarto, came from Denham's press in the years



named. Finally we have the 'Five hundred pointes of good husbandry,' by that quaint and curious writer Thomas Tusser. The book had first appeared nearly thirty years before from the press of Richard Tottell, as 'a Hundreth good pointes of husbandrie,' but had been enlarged to 'Five hundred pointes' in 1573. The book is full of wise saws and weather lore, dressed up in doggerel verse.

In 1583 Henry Bynneman died, having appointed Henry Denham and Ralph Newbery his executors. Shortly after this Denham, there is reason to believe, started the Eliot's Court Printing House, which was run by a syndicate of printers, three of whom, Ninian Newton, Arnold Hatfield, and Edmund Bollifant, had been in Denham's service as apprentices. Amongst the earliest productions of this press was the '*Britannicae Historiae libri sex*,' of Virunus Ponticus, with which was incorporated the '*Itinerarium Cambria*' and '*Cambriae Descriptio*' of Giraldus, the work being printed for Henry Denham and Ralph Newbery.

There is also reason to believe that Denham was one of the assigns of Christopher Barker.

The extent of Denham's business is shown by the fact that in 1583 he was returned as having four presses. In 1586-7, and again in 1588-9, he served the office of Junior Warden of the Company, but he never reached the Mastership. The last entry under his name occurs in the registers on the 3rd December, 1589. Sometime in the year 1585 he moved to the Star in Aldersgate Street, and while there he printed the 1587 edition of Holinshed's 'Chronicles,' in folio, in which he held shares with

250 HENRY DENHAM, PRINTER.

John Harison the eldest, George Bishop, Ralph Newbery, and Thomas Woodcock.

Denham used two devices, the earlier a simple star, and the later the star surrounded by a heavy frame, in which the arms of the city of London and the Stationers' Company were incorporated. These marks passed to Richard Yardley and Peter Short, who succeeded to the business.

HENRY R. PLUMER.

## THE FATE OF THE BASKERVILLE TYPES.

**H**ITHERTO the history of the Baskerville types has practically ended with the breaking up of Beaumarchais' Kehl press in 1810. There are rumours of sales about that period. Messrs. Strauss and Dent in their 'John Baskerville,' p. 133, print an advertisement of a proposed sale of 'Caractères de Baskerville.' The bill is undated, but in the opinion of the authors it belongs to the early years of the nineteenth century. Did this sale ever take place? We cannot certainly say. It is said that the Empress of Russia purchased a quantity of the type. This rumour may have sprung from the known intention of Catherine of Russia at an earlier date to print an edition of Voltaire, an intention which spurred Beaumarchais to undertake his famous Baskerville edition. This association of a Russian empress with Baskerville at second hand might easily have suggested the report. However, there is probably no truth in it. All, or certainly the greater part of, Beaumarchais' stock of Baskerville type was sold, probably in 1818, by Madame Delarue, his daughter, to the famous printer Pierre Didot, who bought the types, not for use, but as objects of curiosity. In January of 1819 Didot offered them to Francis Henry Egerton,

afterwards 8th Earl of Bridgewater, well known in Paris at the time as a collector of MSS. and curiosities. Egerton does not appear to have closed with the offer, and the types pass out of sight again. The letter from Didot to Egerton (Eg. MS. 61, folio 161), printed below, gives the facts on which this note is based.

Ce 16 Janvier 1819.

MY LORD

J'ai fait depuis peu l'acquisition de tous les types de Baskerville, c'est à dire de tous ses poinçons en acier, et de toutes ses matrices en cuivre, au nombre d'environ vingt deux caractères différents depuis le plus petit jusqu' au plus gros, romain et italique. C'est l'ensemble d'une des plus belles fonderies qui existent ; et je l'ai achetée par occasion, et simplement comme objet de curiosité, n'ayant pas eu envie d'y mettre un grand prix, ma nouvelle fonderie à laquelle je travaille depuis huit années consécutives étant bientôt terminée. Cette fonderie de Baskerville se compose de plus de trois mille poinçons en acier, et d'autant de matrices. Beaumarchais la lui a payée vingt mille livres sterling. C'est de Madame Delarue, fille de Beaumarchais, que j'ai fait cette acquisition, partie en argent, partie en éditions imprimées par moi. Si, comme objet de curiosité, ce bel ensemble de types anglais parait vous convenir, j'ai l'honneur de vous le proposer pour le prix de six mille francs. De plus, dans quelque pays que ce fût, cette fonderie pourroit encore faire un état à quelqu'un que vous auriez intention de récompenser, ou d'encourager.

J'ai l'honneur d'être avec respect, my Lord,

Votre très humble et obéissant serviteur,

P. DIDOT, l'aîné.

R. FLOWER.

## THE SO-CALLED GUTENBERG DOCUMENTS.

(Continued from p. 167.)

XI. [1436 to] 12 December 1439:

**R**ECORDS of a law-suit brought by Jerge (George) Dritzehen for himself, and on behalf of his brother Claus, against Johann Gutenberg, before the Great Council of Strassburg.

These records appear to have consisted of six several entries in three separate Registers, which, for the sake of reference, I will again call A, B, and C, as in my 'Gutenberg,' p. 23 *sqq.* A and B, said to have been preserved in the Town Library at Strassburg till 1870, are believed to have been destroyed in that year during the bombardment of that city by the Germans.

In volume A (which seems to have contained the entries of the depositions of witnesses in suits before the Council as the cases came forward) were written the *first* entry (the depositions of thirteen witnesses of Jerge Dritzehen against Gutenberg), and also the *second* (the depositions of three witnesses of Gutenberg against Jerge Dritzehen).

N.B.—By some accident, 'But' on page 158, line 15, was altered into 'And.'

According to Laborde this volume consisted of two quires, each of forty-two sheets, or eighty-four leaves, which were covered by a sheet of parchment, on the recto of which was written: 'Dicta . . . Testium magni consilij Anno Domini M<sup>o</sup>.CCCC<sup>o</sup>. Tricesimo nono.'

The earlier portion of volume B (which, according to Schoepflin, had the title, 'Queremonie & testes registrati Magni Consilii, Anno Dni M<sup>o</sup>.CCCC<sup>o</sup>.XXX nono) contained the *third* entry ('Querimonia' of Lorentz Beildeck, one of the witnesses of Jerge Dritzehen); in its later portion were written the *fourth* (list of Gutenberg's witnesses against Jerge Dritzehen) and the *fifth* (list of Jerge Dritzehen's witnesses against Gutenberg) entries.

The *sixth* and last entry is the sentence of the Strassburg Senate in the lawsuit; it is dated: 'Vigil. Lucie & Otilie Anno xxxix' (*i.e.* 12 Dec. 1439), and was, so far as our information goes, written in volume C, which seems to have contained other decisions of the Strassburg Council.

Leon De Laborde evidently saw the volumes A and B at Strassburg about 1840, for he describes them carefully, and gives facsimiles of eleven different passages from them in his 'Débuts de l'Imprimerie à Strasbourg' (Paris, 1840). He even prints the 'Depositions' line for line, apparently as they were in the MS., but the 'Querimonia' in the ordinary way. Of volume C he says nothing, and could not have seen it, if we may rely on the statement of J. F. Lobstein, on p. 327 of his 'Manuel du Notariat en Alsace' (Strassburg,

1844), that 'among the protocols of the Chancery, those of the year 1439, which contained, with other things, the sentence of the Senate in the lawsuit between Gutenberg and André Dritzehen, were burned at the celebration of the first fête of the Supreme Being, the 20th Brumaire of the year II. (Nov. 20, 1793).' Schoepflin tells us in 1761 (p. 347 of vol. ii. of his 'Alsatia illustrata') that that part of the Acts, which contains the sentence of the Senate (therefore, vol. C) had been *communicated* to him in 1740 by Jac. Wencker, and in his 'Programma' of 1740 he had already said that he owed the public documents to Wencker, those of the St. Thomas Chapter to Schertzius; and that the depositions of the witnesses (therefore the Registers A and B) were found in 1745 by Jo. Henr. Barth (then archivist). But from what he said in 1760 ('Vindiciae typ.,' pp. 13, 14), it would seem that Barth was merely present when he (Schoepflin) opened the volume of 1439 and '*discovered* the name of Gutenberg, the witnesses and their testimonies regarding the Gutenbergian secret.' Dibdin had visited Strassburg in 1818, and from what he says (on p. 53 of vol. iii. of his 'Bibliographical Tour') it is clear that he then saw volume A only. Schaab, Schweighäuser (1826-30), and Bernard (1853), only speak of the volumes A and B. Hence it is clear that no one, not even Schoepflin, has ever seen the volume C, Wencker, the discoverer, of course excepted. Schorbach ('Festschrift,' p. 210) tells us that 'it must have contained the *concept* of the Sentence, from which a document on vellum was to be



prepared, which, however, has not come down to us.'

The text of these records, now hopelessly lost, was published for the first time by Schoepflin in 1760 ('*Vindiciae typ.*,' sec. pars, pp. 5-30, all from the originals?); again by Bernays and With, in 1833, in '*Quartalbl. des Vereins f. Lit. u. Kunst zu Mainz*, iv., 1833 (which I have not seen), the 'Depositions' only from the original; by De Laborde in 1840, with a French translation ('*Débuts*,' etc., pp. 22 *sqq.*), the 'Depositions' from the originals(?), with some extracts from them in facsimile, but the 'Sentence' from Schoepflin's text(?); in 1882, with an English translation, by Hessels ('*Gutenberg: Was he the Inventor or Printing?*' p. 34 *sqq.*), from De Laborde's and Schoepflin's texts; in 1900 by Schorbach ('*Festschrift*,' p. 195 *sqq.*), also from Schoepflin and De Laborde's texts.

I regret that want of space prevents me from printing here the German text and my translation in parallel columns, as was done in my '*Gutenberg*.' The originals being lost, the German could only have been given from De Laborde's or Schoepflin's text, and it may just as well be consulted in their own books, or in Schorbach's treatise (with facsimiles taken from De Laborde's facsimiles), or in my '*Gutenberg*.' I believe, however, that my translation by itself will be sufficient to form an estimate both of the value of the document and of the criticisms made upon it; and in reprinting it, I avail myself of the few corrections suggested by Schorbach and other bibliographers.

[ENGLISH TRANSLATION.<sup>1</sup>]

*First entry:* This is the truth which *Jerge* [*George*] *Dritzehen* deposed against *Johan von Mentze* named *Gutenberg*. In the presence of *Claus Duntzenheim* and *Claus zur Helten*.

[1st Witness] *Barbel von Zabern*, the trades-woman, said one night she talked about several things with *Andres Dritzehen*, and also said to him: 'Will you not go now and sleep?' He replied: 'I must make this first.' Said she: 'But . . . how much money do you spend; this must have cost you more than x guilders.' He answered: 'Fool, thinkest thou that it has cost me only x guilders; if thou hadst as much as it has cost me over 300 guilders, thou wouldst have enough for thy life, and what it has cost me less than 500 guilders is very little, besides what it will still cost me; wherefore I have mortgaged my house and my ground.' Said she: 'If you fail, what will you do?' Says he: 'We cannot fail; before a year is passed we have our capital back, and shall all be happy, unless God wish to punish us.'

[2nd W.] Dame *Ennel*, the wife of *Hans Schulheiss*, wood merchant, said that *Lorentz Beildeck* came into her house to *Claus Dritzehen*, her cousin, and said to him: 'Dear *Claus Dritzehen*,<sup>2</sup> the blessed *Andres Dritzehen* has *four pieces*<sup>3</sup> lying in a *press*; now *Gutenberg*<sup>4</sup> has requested that you will take them out of the *press* and separate them the one from the other, that no one may know what it is, because he would not like that anybody saw it.' *Ennel* also said: 'When she was staying with *Andres Dritzehen*, her

<sup>1</sup> This translation is as literal as possible. Here and there a few unimportant or redundant words have been omitted, such as 'the blessed,' which corresponds to our 'the late.'

<sup>2</sup> Schoepflin tells us that here the MS. has 'min Juncher Hanns Guttemberg hatt uch gebetten das,' but marked for omission.

<sup>3</sup> Schoepflin translates *paginas*.

<sup>4</sup> *gutenberg*, written in the margin.

cousin, she often helped him to make *the work* by day and night,' and 'she knew well that *Andres Dritzehen* . . . had, at one time, mortgaged his capital, but did not know whether he used that for *the work*.'

[3rd W.] *Hanns Sidenneger* said 'that *Andres Dritzehen* had often told him that he had spent much money on the *before-mentioned work*, . . .<sup>1</sup> and that it cost him much, and said to him (witness), he did not know how he should act in *this matter*.' Witness replied: 'Andres, hast thou got into it, thou must get out of it also.' Andres said: 'he had to mortgage his property,' and witness answered: 'Yes, mortgage it, and tell nobody anything about it; Andres now has done this, though he did not know whether the sum, at that time, had been large or small.'

[4th W.] *Hanns Schultheiss* said that *Lorents Beildeck* came to his house to *Claus Dritzehen*, when this witness had conducted him thither, when *Andres Dritzehen*, his brother, had died, and then *Lorentz Beildeck* said to *Claus Dritzehen*: '*Andres Dritzehen*, your . . . brother has *four pieces*<sup>2</sup> lying underneath in a *press*, and *Hanns Gutemberg* has requested you that you should take them out of it and lay them separate on the *press*, so that nobody can see what it is.' Therefore *Claus Dritzehen* went and searched for the *pieces*,<sup>3</sup> but found nothing. Witness also had heard, some time ago, from *Andres Dritzehen*, before he died, that he had said *the work* had cost him more than 300 guilders.

[5th W.] *Cunrad Sahspach* said that *Andres Heilman* had come to him in the *Kremer street*, and said to him: 'dear Conrad, as *Andres Dritzehen* has died, and thou hast made the *press* and knowest of the affair, so go thither and take the *pieces*<sup>3</sup> out of the *press*, and take them the one from the other, then nobody knows what it is.'

<sup>1</sup> De Laborde prints five dots here in the German text, without saying what they mean; perhaps some words were crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> Schoepflin translates *paginas* in both these places.

<sup>3</sup> Schoepflin translates *paginas*.

When this witness wished to do this and searched, which was on St. Stephen's day last, the thing was gone. This witness also said 'that *Andres Dritzehen* had, at a certain time, borrowed money from him, which he used for *the work*; and complained that he had to mortgage his income,' to which witness replied: 'this is bad; but it thou hast got into it, thou must also get out of it;' therefore he knew well that he had mortgaged his income.

[6th W.] *Wernher Smalriem* said that he [?] had made about three or four *purchases*, but did not know whom it concerned; and among other things there was a purchase of 113 guilders, towards which three of them had subscribed for 60 guilders, while *Andres Dritzehen* engaged for 20 guilders. And at a certain time, before the term, *A. Dritzehen* said to this witness 'that he should come home and take the 20 guilders.' But witness answered: 'he should bring the money together and collect for him,' which *Andres* did. But afterwards *Andres* came again to witness and said: 'that the money was together in the house of Mr. *Anthonie Heilman*, where he could fetch it,' which witness did, and took the money in Mr. *Anthonie's* house, and the rest of the money was certainly paid by *Fridel von Seckingen*.

[7th W.] *Mydehart Stocker* said: When *Andres Dritzehen*, on St. John's day at Christmas, when the procession took place, lay down and became ill, he was lying in the room of witness on a bed. Witness said: 'Andres, how are you,' and he replied: 'I know I am mortally ill,' and 'if I were to die I should wish never to have joined the partnership.' Witness asked why, and he replied: 'I know well that my brothers never can agree with *Gutenberg*.' Said witness: 'has then the association not been written down, or have no persons been present?' Said *Andres*: 'yes, it has been written down.' Then witness

<sup>1</sup> De Laborde prints here a line of dots, without saying what they mean; perhaps some words were deleted in the MS. Schoepflin's text runs on.

asked him how the partnership had been made, and he replied: '*Andres Heilmann, Hanns Riffe, Gutenberg*, and himself had entered into partnership, to which, as he recollected, *Andres Heilman* and himself had each contributed 80 guilders. And when they were in this partnership, *Andres Heilman* and himself came to *Gutenberg* at St. Arbogast, where he had *concealed several arts*<sup>1</sup> from them, which he was not obliged to show them. This did not please them; whereupon they had broken up the partnership and replaced it by another to this effect, that *Andres Heilman* and himself should each add so much to the first 80 guilders that it would make 500 guilders, which<sup>2</sup> they<sup>2</sup> did,<sup>2</sup> and they two were one man in the partnership. And similarly *Gutenberg* and *Hanns Riffe* should each contribute as much as the two, and then *Gutenberg* should conceal<sup>3</sup> from them none of *the arts* he knew.<sup>3</sup> Concerning this an association-contract was made, and in case one of the partners died, the others should pay 100 guilders to the heirs of the deceased, and the rest of the money and all that belonged to the association should remain in the partnership as the property of the other partners.' Witness also said that *Andres Dritzehen* had told him at that time 'that he knew very well from himself that he had often mortgaged his income,' though he did not know whether this was much or little, nor whether he had employed it for *the work* or not.

In the presence of *Diebolt Brant* and [*Jocop*]<sup>4</sup> *Rotgebe*.

[8th W.] Mr. *Peter Eckhart*, parish priest at St. Martin, said that the blessed *Dritzehen*, during the Christmas feastsdays, sent to him to hear his confession, and when he came to him and he confessed freely, witness asked him

<sup>1</sup> Schoepflin translates: *Nonnulla artis suae arcana*.

<sup>2</sup> These three words correspond to German words in De Laborde's text; they are not in Schoepflin's text.

<sup>3</sup> Schoepflin translates: *Omnia artis suae, quae nosset, arcana communicaret*.

<sup>4</sup> Added by Schoepflin.

'whether he owed anybody anything, or whether anyone was indebted to him, or whether he had given anything, he should say so'; and *Andres* replied: 'he had a partnership with several persons, *Andres Heilman* and others, and had laid out certainly 200 or 300 guilders, so that he had not a penny left'; and he also said that *Andres Dritzehen* at that time was lying in bed in his clothes.

[9th W.] *Thoman Steinbach* said that *Hesse*, retail-dealer, came to him at one time and asked him 'whether he knew of any purchase in which little could be lost,' as he knew several [persons], but mentioned among such *Johann Gutenberg*, *Andres Dritzehen*, and a [certain] *Heilmann*, who were likely to be in want of ready money. Then this witness bought for them 14 Lützelburger,<sup>1</sup> and knew a merchant who would buy them again, and he did sell them again, and 12½ guilders were lost by it; *Fridel von Seckingen* remained surety for them, and it was written down in the book of the sale-house.

[10th W.] *Lorentz Beildeck* said that *Johann Gutenberg* sent him at one time to *Claus Dritzehen*, after the death of his brother *Andres*, to tell *Claus D.* that he should not show to anyone the *press* which he had under his care, which witness did. He [Gutenberg] also said, that he should take great care and go to the *press* and open this by means of the *two little buttons*, whereby<sup>2</sup> the *pieces* would fall asunder. He should then put those *pieces* in or on the *press*,<sup>3</sup> after which nobody could see or comprehend anything. And after the mourning ceremonies,<sup>3</sup> he was to come to *Johann Gutenberg*, who had something to talk about with him. Witness knew well that *Johann*

<sup>1</sup> The meaning of this word is apparently not known.

<sup>2</sup> Schoepflin translates, *ut paginae dilabantur in partes, easque partes vel intra vel supra prelum poneret.*

<sup>3</sup> In my 'Gutenberg' (p. 41) I followed De Laborde and Van der Linde in translating the German 'wenn ir leit uskeme.' According to Schorbach, Schoepflin translates correctly 'justis solutis.'

*Gutenberg* owed nothing to *Andres*, but that *Andres* was indebted to *Gutenberg*, and was to pay him this debt by instalments, but died while he was paying it. He also said that he had never been present at their re-union, since their re-unions had taken place after Christmas. Witness had often seen *Andres Dr. dine* at *Johann Gutenberg's*, but he had never seen him give a penny.

[11th W.] *Reimbolt von Ehenheim* said that shortly before Christmas he came to *Andres* and asked him 'what he did with those *troublesome things* with which he was busy.' *Andres* answered 'that it had cost him more than 500 guilders, but he hoped, when it should be ready, to gain a good quantity of money, with which he should pay this witness and others and see all his sufferings rewarded.' Witness said that on that occasion he lent him 8 guilders, as he was in want of money. Witness' housekeeper had often lent money to *Andres*, and *Andres* once came to this witness with a ring which he valued at 30 guilders, which he pawned for him at *Ehenheim* with the Jews for 5 guilders. Witness moreover said that he knew well that, in the autumn, he had put two half-omens of sodden wine into two vessels, and sent one half-omen to *Johann Gutenberg*, and presented the other half to *Midehart*, and also presented *Gutenberg* with a quantity of pears. *Andres* also requested this witness at one time to buy him two half-measures of wine, which witness did, and of these two half-measures *Andres Dritzehn* and *Andres Heilman* presented one to *Hans Gutenberg*.

[12th W.] *Hans Niger von Bischoviszheim* said that *Andres* came to him and said 'that he was in want of money, wherefore he had to press him and his other money-lenders, as he had something in hand on which he could not spend money enough. Hence witness asked him what he was doing, to which he replied 'he was a manufacturer of *looking-glasses*.' Then witness had his corn ground, and took it to *Mollsheim* and *Ehenheim*, where he sold it, and paid him [the money]. Witness



also said that he [*Dritzehen*] and *Reimbolt* bought from him at one time two half-measures of wine, and he transported it; and when he came to St. Arbegast he had also half an omen of sodden wine on his cart, which *Andres* took and carried it in to *Johann Gutenberg*, and also a good quantity of pears; and of these two half-measures *Andres Dr.* and *Andres Heilmann* presented one half to *Johann Gutenberg*.

*In the presence of Böschwilt.*

[13th W.] *Fridel von Seckingen* said that *Gutenberg* had made a purchase and that he had become surety for him, and that he did not know but that it concerned Mr. *Anthonie Heilman* also, and that afterwards the debt concerning this purchase had been paid. He also said that *Gutenberg*, *Andres Heilmann*, and *Andres Dritzehen* had requested him to become their surety with *Stoltz*, the husband of Peter's daughter, for 101 guilders, which he did in this way, that these three should give him, on this account, a letter of indemnification, which indeed had been written and sealed with the seals of *Gutenberg* and *Andres Heilman*. But *Andres Dritzehen* always delayed the matter, and he could not induce him to seal it. *Gutenberg*, however, paid afterwards all the money at the time of the fair of last Lent. This witness also said that he did not know of the partnership of the above three, because he had never been joined to it, nor had he been present.

*Second Entry:* *Gutenberg's* testimony against *Jörg Dritzehen*. In the presence of *Franz Berner* and *Böschwiler*.

[14th W.] [a] Mr. *Anthonie Heilmann* said: When he became aware that *Gutenberg* would accept *Andres Dritzehen* for a third part in the pilgrimage to Aix-la-Chapelle about the looking-glasses, he urgently requested him to accept also his brother *Andres* if he wished to render him [*Anthonie*]

a great service.<sup>1</sup> [*Gutenberg*] then said to him: 'he feared the friends of *Andres* would at once say it were juggling,<sup>2</sup> which he would not like.' For that reason he [*Anton*] begged him again, and drew up a contract which he should show to both, and which they should carefully discuss;<sup>3</sup> he brought him the contract, and they resolved to act according to the contract, which was, therefore, agreed upon. [b] During these arrangements *Andres Dritzehen* requested this witness to help him with money, to which he replied that if he had a good security, he would soon help him, and at last assisted him with 90 lbs., and brought him the money at St. Arbcast, whereby he redeemed 2 lbs. of money from the St. Agnes nuns; and this witness asked, 'what do you ask so much money for, as you don't want more than 80 guilders?' He replied that 'he wanted still more money, and two or three days in Lent before Lady Day he had to give 80 guilders to *Gutenberg*.' This witness also gave 80 guilders, as the agreement was 80 guilders for each share, and the other third part, which *Gutenberg* still had, would become *Gutenberg's* property, as his share and for his art, and would not be put into any partnership. [c] Afterwards *Gutenberg* said to this witness that 'he had to mention something else, namely, that there should be equality in everything because he [*Anton*] had done so much for him, and that they should understand each other well that the one should conceal nothing from the other, and<sup>4</sup> that it should serve also the others.'<sup>4</sup> Witness was pleased by this conversation, and spoke highly of it to the other two, and long afterwards he [*Gutenberg*] repeated this conversation, and witness requested him as before and said that he wished to make himself worthy of it. After this [*Gutenberg*] made a contract according to this proposition, and said to this witness: 'Tell them that

<sup>1</sup> De Laborde prints here a star, but does not say what it means.

<sup>2</sup> So according to Schorbach, not *sorcery*.

<sup>3</sup> De Laborde prints here two stars without saying what they mean.

<sup>4</sup> Schoepflin translates: *idque ad reliquum opus pertinere*.

they should consider it carefully whether this be convenient to them.' This he did, and they discussed this point a long time, and even consulted [*Gutenberg*] who said afterwards: 'there are at present so many tools ready and in course of preparation, that your part is very near your own money [which you advanced], and so the art will be confided to you gratuitously.' [d] In this manner they agreed with him on two points, one of which was to be quite done with, and the other to be well explained. The point which was to be regarded as settled was that they wished to be under no obligation to *Hans Riffen*, either great or small, as they had nothing from him; whatever they had they had from *Gutenberg*. The matter to be explained was that, if one of them happened to die, exact explanation should be given; and they decided that, at the end of the 5 years, they should pay to the heirs of deceased, for *all things made or unmade*, for the money advanced, which every partner had to pay in the expenses, and for the forms and for all tools, *nothing excepted*, 100 guilders. In case, therefore, of his death, it would be a great advantage to them, because he left them everything which he could have taken as his part for the expenses, and yet they had not to pay his heirs more than a 100 guilders for everything, just as one of the others. And this was stipulated in order that, if anyone died, they should not be under the necessity of *teaching, telling, or revealing the art* to all the heirs, which was as favourable to the one as to the others. [e] Thereupon the two *Andreses* told witness [i.e. *Anton Heilmann*], under the 'Kürsenern,' that they had agreed with *Gutenberg* regarding the contract, and that he had settled the point regarding *Hanns Riffen*, and wished to explain to them the last point further as it was put in the next article. They also said that *Andres Dritzehen* had given 40 guilders to *Gutenberg*, and the witness's brother [*Andres Heilmann*] had given him 50 guilders, as the agreement was 50 guilders for this term, as was shown by the contract, and afterwards, the following Christmas, 20 guilders, which

was Christmas last, and then afterwards, at mid Lent [the 4th Sunday in Lent], as much as the contract showed which witness had signed. And witness also said that he acknowledges the contract by the terms, and the money was not put into the association, but was to belong to *Gutenberg*. Neither had *Andres Dritzehen* lived in common with them, and had never spent any money, not even for the food and drink which they took outside [the town, i.e. at St. Arbogast]. [f] Witness also said that he knew very well that *Gutenberg*, shortly before Christmas, had sent his servant to the two *Andreses* to fetch all the forms, and that they were taken<sup>1</sup> asunder<sup>1</sup> before his eyes, which he [either witness or *Gutenberg*] regretted on account of several forms. At the time that *Andres* died and this witness well knew that people would have liked to see the press, *Gutenberg* said they should send for the press, as he feared that any one should see it, whereupon he sent his man to take it to pieces; and when he had the time he would talk with him, which was what he proposed to him. He also said that on the part of *Reimbolt Museler* and on his own part they had never been summoned. [g] Mr. *Anthonie Heilmann* also said that the longest of the two contracts was that mentioned above, which *Gutenberg* caused to be given to the two *Andreses* to consult

<sup>1</sup> The German text has *zurlossen*, and opinions differ as to the meaning of this word. Schoepflin, Meerman, and De Laborde took it to mean *to take asunder*. In my '*Gutenberg*' (p. 47) I adopted this interpretation, because, as I explained in a note, the history and development of the word showed that this meaning was the prevailing one, and all the previous witnesses (see Nos. 2, 4, 5, 10) had spoken of 'something having to be taken to pieces' or separated. But I pointed out that, according to Lexer's '*Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterb.*' (III. 1072, voce *zerlāszen*), it may also mean *to melt*, and that Van der Linde had adopted this meaning. Dr. Schorbach ('*Festschrift*,' p. 203), without referring us to any authority, says that at Strassburg in the fifteenth century, the word only meant *to melt*. For the reasons stated above, I feel bound to retain the interpretation *to take asunder*.

about it; and of the other contract, which was said to have been the first, witness did not know whether this was the case or not, as he had forgotten it. He also said that *Andres Dritzehn* and *Andres Heilman* had given to the said *Gutenberg* half a measure of wine in return for what they had eaten and drunk with him outside [the town]. *Andres Dritzehn*, in particular, presented him with one omen of sodden wine and nearly a hundred baskets of pears. He also said that he asked his brother when they commenced to learn, to which he replied that *Gutenberg* still claimed 10 guilders from *Andres Dritzehn* of the 50 which<sup>1</sup> he should have repaid.<sup>1</sup>

[15th W.] *Hans Dünne*, the goldsmith, said that three years ago or thereabout he had earned from *Gutenberg* nearly 100 guilders, merely for that which belonged to printing.<sup>2</sup>

[16th W.] *Midehart Stocker* said that he<sup>3</sup> knew well that *Andreas Dritzehn* had mortgaged the . . . vi [lbs.] . . .<sup>4</sup> of money for 120 lbs., and that this same money had become the property of his brother *Claus Dritzehn*, and that the same *Claus* had given this money to those of *Bischofsheim* near *Rosheim* for 12 lbs. of money of a life-annuity . . . when *Andres* would enjoy the same life-annuity during his lifetime. And it was agreed that the money which he would put into the association should be paid by instalments. He also said that<sup>3</sup> he had heard from *Andres Dritzehn* that he said may God help him that the work made in the partnership might be sold, in

<sup>1</sup> The German has 'so er an ruckes geben solt han.' The two words *an ruckes* are obscure. Some see a date in them; others think it means *as arrears*; *back*.

<sup>2</sup> See a facsimile of this whole clause in *De Laborde's 'Débuts'* (Plate II., No. 10), apparently taken from the original; and one in *Schorbach's Atlas* to the 'Festschrift' (Plate 7), taken from *De Laborde's* facsimile.

<sup>3</sup> All that follows till the next<sup>3</sup> is not found in *Schoepflin's* text, who prints five dots after the first 'said.'

<sup>4</sup> So in *De Laborde*.

which case he hoped and trusted that he would get out of all his needs.

*Third entry:* Querimonia of Lorentz Beildeck.<sup>1</sup>

I, *Lorentz Beildeck*, complain before you, Lords magistrates, on account of *Jörg Dritzehen*, that he—having summoned me before you, my Lords magistrates and council, to give him a testimony, and I having said on my sworn oath what I knew of the matter—that yet the said *Jörg Dritzehen* has again come before you and forwarded a messenger to me to give him a testimony, and has said that at first I have not spoken the truth. He has also publicly said to me: hearest thou, witness, thou shalt have to tell me the truth even if I should have to go to the gallows with thee; and has therefore criminally accused me and represented that I am a perjured criminal, and has, by the grace of God, done me wrong, which is a bad affair.

*Fourth entry:* List of Gutenberg's witnesses against *Jerge Dritzehen*.

This is *Gutenberg's* truth against *Jerge Dritzehen*: (1) Item Her Anthonie Heilman [14th W.]—(2) Item Andres Heilman—(3) Item Claus Heilman—(4) Item Mudart Stocker [7th and 16th W.]—(5) Item Lorentz Beldeck [10th W., and see the *third* entry]—(6) Item Wernher Smalriem [6th W.]—(7) Item Fridel von Seckingen [13th W.]—(8) Item Ennel Drytzezen [2nd W.]—(9) Item Conrat Saspach [5th W.]—(10) Item Hans Dunne [15th W.]—(11) Item Meister Hirtz—(12) Item Her Heinrich Olse—(13) Item Hans Riffe—(14) Item Her Johans Dritzehen.

*Fifth entry:* List of *Jerge Dritzehen's* witnesses against *Hans Gutenberg*.

This is *Jerge Dritzehen's* truth against *Hans Gutenberg*:

<sup>1</sup> On this *Querimonia* see Bockenheimer, 'Gutenberg-Feier,' p. 60.

(1) Item Lütpriester zu Sant Martin [8th W.]—(2) Item Fridel von Seckingen [13th W.]—(3) Item Jocop Imeler—(4) Item Hans Sydenneger [3rd W.]—(5) Item Midhart Honöwe—(6) Item Hans Schultheis der holzman [4th W.]—(7) Item Ennel Dritzehen sin husfröwe [2nd W.]—(8) Item Hans Dunne der goltsmit [15th W.]—(9) Item Meister Hirtz—(10) Item Heinrich Bisinger—(11) Item Wilhelm von Schutter—(12) Item Wernher Smalriem [6th W.]—(13) Item Thoman Steinbach [9th W.]—(14) Item Saspach Cunrat [5th W.]—(15) Item Lorentz Gutenbergs knecht und sin fröwe [10th W.]—(16) Item Reimbolt von Ehenheim [11th W.]—(17) Item Hans IX jor von Bischoffsheim [12th W.]—(18) Item Stöszer Nese von Ehenheim—(19) Item Berbel das clein fröwel [1st W.]—(20) Item Her Jerge Saltzmütter—(21) Item Heinrich Sidenneger—(22) Item ein brief über X.lb. gelts hant die Herren zum jungen Sant Peter her Andres versetzt—(23) Item ein brieff über II.lb. gelts hant die Wurmser ouch—(24) Item Hans Ross der goltsmit und sin fröwe—(25) Item Her Gosse Sturm zu Sant Arbegast—(26) Item Martin Verwer.

[Sixth entry: Sentence of the Council.]

We, *Cune Nope*, the Master and the Council at Strassburg, announce to all who will see this letter, or hear it read, that before us has appeared *Jerge Dritzehen*, our citizen, in his own name and with full power of *Claus Dritzehen*, his brother, and laid a claim against *Hans Genszfleisch von Mentz genant Gutenberg*, our inhabitant, and said: *Andres Dritzehen*, his brother, had inherited some goods from his father, which paternal inheritance and goods he had rather heavily mortgaged, and thereby procured himself a good deal of money; and he had also entered into an association and partnership with *Hans Gutenberg* and others, and had put this money into this partnership to *Gutenberg*, and that for a considerable time they had made and exercised their trade with each other,



of which they had derived a good deal of profit. And *Andres Drytzen* had remained security in many places when they bought *lead* and other things belonging to it, which [securities] he had redeemed and paid. Now, when the said *Andres* had died, he [Jerge] and his brother *Claus* had often demanded of *Hansz Gutenberg* that he would take them into the partnership in the place of their brother, or to make an agreement with them regarding the money which he had brought into the partnership; which he [Gutenberg] declined to do, and excused himself by saying that *Andres Drytzen* had never brought such money to him into the partnership; as he [Jerge], however, hoped and trusted honestly to show that the matter had passed as he had said before, and on that account he still desired that *Gutenberg* should put him and his brother *Clauss* into their inheritance and into the partnership in the place of their brother, or to pay back the money which their brother had contributed, because it reasonably belonged to them as an inheritance and by right, or to say why he would not do this.

Against this *Gutenberg* answered, that he considered such a demand on the part of *Jerge Drytzen* unreasonable, because he could know, through many writings and contracts, which he and his brother must have found after the death of their brother *Andres Drytzen*, how he [Gutenberg] and his brother [Andres] had associated with each other: namely, *Andres Drytzen* had come to him some years ago with the understanding to learn and comprehend some arts from him; for which reason he had taught him, in consequence of his request, to *polish stones*, of which he had enjoyed [some] good [profits] at the time. Yet, after a considerable time, he and *Hanns Riffen*, Provost of *Lichtenow*, came to an understanding about an *art* which was to be used on the occasion of the *Ocher pilgrimage* [to *Aix-la-Chapelle*], and they had united on the condition that *Gutenberg* should have two parts, and *Hans Riffe* a third part in this undertaking. Now, *Andres Drytzen*

had become aware of this, and requested him to teach and show him also this *art*, promising him to pay for it whatever he should desire. Meantime Mr. *Anthonie Heilmann* requested him also on the part of his brother, *Andres Heilmann*, and he had considered the request of both, and promised them to teach and instruct them in it, and also to give and transfer to them the half of *such art and adventure*, so that they two would get one part, *Hans Riff* the other part, and he [*Gutenberg*] the half. On that account the two would have to pay to *Gutenberg* 160 guilders into his purse, for his teaching and instructing them in the *art*. He had received, indeed, at that time, 80 guilders from each of them, as they imagined that the pilgrimage would take place that year, and they had prepared themselves with *their art*. But when the pilgrimage was put off for one year, they further desired from him and requested him to teach them all his<sup>1</sup> *arts and adventure*<sup>1</sup> which he might further, or in another way learn, or knew at present, and to conceal nothing from them. Thus they persuaded him and came to an understanding, and it was agreed that in addition to the first sum they should give him 250 guilders, which would make together 410 guilders. Of this he [*Gutenberg*] was to receive 100 guilders in ready money; and he did receive 50 guilders from *Andres Heilmann*, and 40 guilders from *Andres Dryzehen*, so that *Andres Dryzehen* had still to pay him 10 guilders. Besides this the two should each pay him 75 guilders in three instalments as had previously been agreed upon. But as *Andres Dritzehen* had died within these terms, and the money was still due from him, it was decided that their *adventure*<sup>2</sup> *with the art*<sup>2</sup> should last for five whole years, and in case one of the four died within the five years, then all their *art, tools, and work made already* should remain with the others, and after the expiration of five years the

<sup>1</sup> Schoepflin translates: *artes mirabiles atque secretas*.

<sup>2</sup> Schoepflin translates: *pro exercenda arte mirabili*.

heirs of the deceased should receive 100 guilders. This and other things were written down at the time, and after the [death of] *Andres Dryzehen* they had agreed to prepare a sealed letter about the matter as is clearly shown by the act;<sup>1</sup> and henceforth *Hans Gutenberg* had taught and instructed them in such *undertaking*<sup>2</sup> and *art*,<sup>2</sup> which had been acknowledged by *Andres Dryzehen* on his death-bed. Therefore, and because the contracts which concern it, and were found with *Andres Dryzehen*, clearly declare and contain it, and he [*Gutenberg*] hoped to prove with good witnesses, he desired that *Jørge Dryzehen* and his brother *Clauss* should deduct the 85 guilders, which he had still to claim from their brother, from the 100 guilders, whereupon he should give them the remaining 15 guilders, though he had still some years' time to do this in, according to the contents of the act. And as to *Jerge Dryzehen* having further said how *Andres Dryzehen*, his brother, had raised much upon his father's inheritance and property, or had mortgaged or sold it, this did not concern him [*Gutenberg*], for he had never received more from him than he had related before, except half an omen of sodden wine, a basket with pears, and he [*Dritzehen*] and *Andres Heilmann* had presented him with half a measure of wine, though the two had almost more consumed with him, and for which he had obtained nothing. Moreover, when he demands to put him into his inheritance, he did not know of any inheritance or property into which he could put him, or with which he had anything to do. Nor had *Andres Dryzehen* become his security anywhere, either for *lead* or for *anything else*, except once with *Fridel von Seckingen*, from whom he had redeemed and relieved him after his death, and on that account requests to bring forward his witnesses and truth.

We Master and Council having heard the aforesaid demand and response, the discussion for and against, also

<sup>1</sup> Or *signature*?

<sup>2</sup> Schoepflin translates: *hanc secretam et mirabilem artem*.

the witnesses and truth ; which both parties have brought forward, and having especially seen the contract and the convention, we have agreed with a correct judgment, and pronounce it also as right : while there exists an act which shows in what form the convention has come about and has taken place. Let, therefore, *Hanns Riff*, *Andres Heilmann* and *Hanns Gutenberg* swear an oath by the Saints, that the matters have taken place as the aforesaid act indicates, and that this same act had contained a provision that a sealed letter should have been made of it if *Andres Dryzehen* had remained alive ; and that *Hanns Gutenberg* also take an oath, that he has still to claim 85 guilders from *Andres Dritzehen* ; so that these 85 guilders may be deducted from the abovementioned 100 guilders, and he shall pay the remaining 15 guilders to the said *Jürge* and *Claus Dryzehen*, wherewith the 100 guilders shall have been paid in conformity with the contents of the said act ; and *Gutenberg* shall henceforth have nothing to do or to arrange with *Andres Dryzehen*, on account of the work and the partnership. This oath having been taken before Us by *Hans Riff*, *Andres Heilman*, and *Hanns Gutenberg*, except that *Hanns Riff* has said that he had not been present at the first convention ; but as soon as he came to them and they showed him the convention, he altered nothing ; wherefore we command to maintain this convention. Datum Vigil. Lucie et Otilie Anno XXXIX (12 Dec. 1439).

The above records as they stand would make it appear that in 1439 a certain George Dritzehen, on behalf of himself and his brother Claus, laid a complaint before the great Council of Strassburg against Hans Gutenberg, alleging that Andreas Dritzehen, their brother, who had died at the end of December 1438, had been in partnership with Gutenberg and other persons, and devoted a large

X.

T

part of his paternal inheritance towards this association. For the common enterprise of this partnership, which had carried on business for some time and had produced something, Andreas Dritzehen had, for the purchase of lead and other necessary things, stood security and afterwards made payments. But the plaintiffs, as the heirs of their deceased brother—having repeatedly requested Gutenberg to accept them as partners in their brother's place, or to repay them the money which Andreas had paid, and Gutenberg refusing to comply with their demand—felt compelled to bring their complaint before the court, and proposed that Gutenberg should be ordered to do as they demanded. They called twenty-five witnesses to their aid, though only thirteen seem to have made their appearance, and produced two bonds. The plaintiffs' contention and Gutenberg's reply are included partly in the depositions of the latter's three witnesses (fourteen had been summoned), and partly in the Sentence of the Senate.

Apparently not all the proceedings have been recorded. For instance, Hans Riffe and Andreas Heilmann, who were also members of the association, do not seem to have deposed anything, though they confirmed on oath all that had been said. Secondly, thirty-nine witnesses are mentioned, but we have the depositions of only sixteen.

Gutenberg replied that George Dritzehen's demands were unreasonable. He must have seen this from the contract, found among their brother's inheritance, which he had made a few years ago with the deceased, whom he, at his desire to learn

some arts from him, had taught to 'polish stones,' a work from which he (Andreas) had derived much profit. A long time afterwards [about the beginning of 1438?] Gutenberg had associated with Hanns Riffe for the execution of some work which, as we learn from the witnesses, had as object the making of looking-glasses. Andreas Dritzehen becoming aware of this plan, asked to be also initiated in this art against payment, and a priest, Ant. Heilmann, in behalf of his brother Andreas, addressed a similar request to Gutenberg. On the latter consenting, they agreed that he should receive for his instruction 80 guilders from each new associate. Thereupon they prepared their work for the pilgrimage, in the idea that it would take place the next year (1439). But when they learnt that it would not come off before 1440, the two new partners asked Gutenberg to teach them all his arts and adventures which he knew or would come to know, without concealing anything from them. Gutenberg again assented, and a new contract was made, whereby it was stipulated that the association should continue for five years [1438-43], and if one of the four associates should happen to die within this period, *the whole art, and all the tools, and work prepared* should belong to the three others, on condition that they should pay, after the expiration of the five years, 100 guilders to the heirs of the deceased. All this, Gutenberg said, had been written down at the time for the purpose of drawing up a sealed letter about it. He had, moreover, since that time, as admitted by Andreas Dritzehen on his deathbed, instructed them in such art, and

had, therefore, a right to his payment. Hence he demanded, in accordance with the concept of the contract found among the inheritance of the deceased, that the two plaintiffs should deduct from the 100 guilders to be paid to them the 85 which Andreas Dritzehen still owed him, and he would at once pay the remaining 15, although according to the contract he could still defer doing this for some years.

The verdict of the Council was in favour of Gutenberg; the three associates were ordered to swear on oath that the contract had really existed, and Gutenberg had, besides, to swear that his claim for compensation was justified. The demand of the two Dritzehen was refused, and Gutenberg ordered to pay them the 15 guilders.

Therefore, Gutenberg appears to have been engaged in *three* different undertakings, or arts or handicrafts, for each of which he associated with other persons.

The *first* undertaking in which he gave instruction to Andreas Dritzehen seems to have had no other object than the 'polishing of stones'; and Dritzehen is said to have derived much profit from it.

The other two undertakings would seem to have been carried on first by Gutenberg alone, and afterwards in partnership with other men. These two undertakings and the relations of the partners with one another were regulated by two different contracts.

The first contract (the second undertaking) had as object *the manufacture of looking-glasses*, for sale at



the pilgrimage to Aix-la-Chapelle (*cf.* Witness 12 and 14 and Gutenberg's reply included in the Sentence of the Council).

(a) This contract had first of all been concluded with *Hans Riff von Lichtenau*, and of the *profits* Gutenberg should have two-thirds, Riff the remaining third part.

(b) Thereupon Andreas Dritzehen wishes to take part in the association, and Gutenberg gives him a third share in the *profits* (see Witness No. 14), retaining therefore only one-third himself.

(c) About the same time Andreas Heilmann is accepted as a partner, and consequently Andr. Dritzehen and Andr. Heilmann are allotted each one-eighth share, therefore a quarter between them, Hans Riff another quarter, and Gutenberg the remaining half (see the latter's reply in the sentence). The two new partners paid each 80 guilders in March, 1438 (see Witness No. 7 and 14).

The *second* contract (the third undertaking) made between Gutenberg, Riff, Andr. Dritzehen, and Andreas Heilmann, was to last five years, that is, from 1438 to 1443. It concerned *the exploitation of other ideas*, as Gutenberg promised to give *instruction in new arts*, for which he was to be paid, though he reserved also a share in the work (*cf.* Witness 7 and 14 and the sentence).—Dritzehen and Heilmann should pay together 250 guilders to Gutenberg, that is, 50 guilders each in cash, and further 75 guilders each in three instalments. The cash-payment took place, perhaps, in July 1438, when Andr. Heilmann paid his 50 guilders at once, but Andr. Dritzehen only 40, remaining 10 guilders in

arrear; the first instalment was perhaps to be paid the Christmas following, the second in March 1439, but of the third we have no information, and Andreas Dritzehen died before he had paid the first, remaining, therefore, 85 guilders in arrear (10 + 75).

When we now try to find out the nature and object of Gutenberg's *third* undertaking, which had apparently nothing to do with the polishing of stones (Sentence), or the manufacture of looking-glasses (W. 12, 14), we see, as Bockenheimer points out, that the plaintiffs and their witnesses, as well as Gutenberg and his witnesses, rival each other, as it were, in endeavouring to conceal the purpose and the labours of the association by using words which either have no meaning at all, or may be interpreted in various ways or applied to various trades or handicrafts. Persons of the most diverse walks in life saw the associates at work at all times of the day; they examined and were acquainted to some extent with 'work' done, but none of them ever called the things by a name, or indicated for what purpose they used their apparatus or their instruments. They were all perhaps used to plain speaking among themselves and in ordinary circumstances of life, but in this case they seem to have taxed their ingenuity to the utmost to use words and phrases puzzling at once to themselves and posterity.

The Witnesses 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 speak of a *work*; No. 16 of a *work made*; No. 2 (a woman) had assisted in *making the work* by day and night; Nos. 2, 3 even allude to the witness who had preceded

them, and simply speak of the '*before-mentioned work*,' or '*the said work*'; Nos. 1, 11, 12 allude, still more obscurely, to *this*, to *it*, or to *something*; Nos. 5 and 14 speak of a *thing* (*sache*; *ding*); No. 11 of *troublesome things*.

The Witnesses 2, 4, 5 speak of a *press*; No. 5 even says, or lets another witness say, that he made it; No. 10 says the *press*, of which Claus Dritzehen had charge, should not be shown to anybody; No. 14 says, people wished to see the *press*, and Gutenberg had sent his servant to take it to pieces. But no one says what they had been doing with the press.

The W. 2, 4, 5, 10 speak of 'four *pieces* lying in a *press*, which were to be taken out of it, and laid separate, in order that nobody could see what *it* was'; or (4) of 'four *pieces* lying *underneath* a *press*, which were to be taken out of it, and laid separate *on the press*, so that nobody could see what *it* was'; or (5) of '*pieces* to be taken out of a *press*, and laid asunder, in order that nobody should know what *it* is'; or (10) of a *press* which could be opened by means of two *buttons*, and the *pieces* would fall asunder, and should be laid *in* or *on the press*, so that nobody could see or observe anything. But no one said whether these pieces were of wood or of metal or of any other material.

- \* A priest [the 8th W.] hears the confession of the dying Andreas, and, forgetting in his zeal his most sacred duty of not divulging any confessions, tells the judges what has been confided to him. Perhaps, owing to his presence, the contributions of Andreas Dritzehen towards the association came down from 500 to between 200 or 300 guilders.

W. 6 had made a *purchase*; W. 9 bought fourteen *Lützelburger* for the association; W. 13 says Gutenberg had made a *purchase*; W. 7 speaks of an *art*, and *some arts*; No. 14 of an *art*; of an *art* which was not to be shown or revealed; W. 14 says Gutenberg had said *it* might be called a swindle (*göckelwerck*); he speaks of many *tools* (*vil gezüges*) already existing and to be made; of formes (*formen*); of formes (*formen*) which were to be fetched and laid asunder (or to be *melted*, as some explain).

Only Hans Dünne, one of Gutenberg's witnesses (No. 15), says that, three years ago, he had been printing (*trucken*), and had been paid for it by Gutenberg; but, in harmony with the indifference and mystery conspicuous throughout the whole Records, no one asked him *what* he had printed, or *where* he had been printing, at his own or in Gutenberg's house.

It has been argued that the disputants and the witnesses used such enigmatical words and phrases in order to conceal, as they had designed or been told to do, the nature and the object of their undertaking, which was to remain in the dark. Gutenberg may, indeed, be supposed to have taken such a course, as he and his associates, perhaps even his witnesses, may have considered secrecy to be their only chance of success. But what about the plaintiffs? They must have heard from their brother what was going on in Gutenberg's house or workshop, and were, therefore, in possession, at least to some extent, of the secret. Yet Gutenberg, who had at first been so liberal and good-natured, that he accepted as partners any one who merely asked

him for this favour,—and even high-handedly disposed of the shares which he had already allotted to one of his partners, in order to gratify new applicants—now suddenly decided, apparently for no reason at all, to risk the leaking out of the secret rather than accept these men as partners in their brother's place, and even declined to make a private agreement with them as to the indemnity which they so urgently claimed from him. Might we not have expected these plaintiffs to take a little revenge and give the tribunal some hint as to what the 'work' was, even if they did not reveal the purpose for which it was prepared? But suppose the plaintiffs had thought it their best policy to keep the secret, in the hope, perhaps, of being accepted later on as partners, could they have suborned all their witnesses to do the same? the latter could have had no interest in matters remaining hidden; they had themselves seen, by day and night, what was being done; they had assisted in the 'work'; had made some of the tools; had access to them, and were supposed to be able to break up portions of the 'work,' on receiving orders to do so. Perhaps one or two of them, related to or intimately connected with the plaintiffs, might have considered it advisable to use meaningless, evasive words; but more than a dozen men appeared on behalf of the plaintiffs!

But even if both the parties to the suit and all their witnesses had made an agreement, before they came into court, to speak of nothing but the 'work,' could it be possible that the judges, whom we might have expected to discard all secrecy, or

to unravel it if there were any, had also determined to adopt the same mysterious course? In their summary of the trial, they repeat the substance of Gutenberg's reply to the plaintiffs; they allude to an *association* or *partnership*; to a *work*; to a *trade* (*gewerbe*); to *lead* and other things; to *polishing stones*; to *lead*; to an *art*, or several *arts*; to an *art* and *adventure* (three times); to an *art* which had to be taught; to *arts*, *tools*, and *work made*. But not one of them ventures to enquire into, or to ask for, or to give a definition of the work or the art or the trade on which the litigants are engaged, and to which they make such dark allusions. The judges certainly do not speak of *printing* or of *books*, or of anything like it, and they evidently cared nothing for the printing activity of Hans Dünne. The deceased Andr. Dritzchen said on his death-bed that he and Andreas Heilmann had called one day on Gutenberg and then seen that the latter was concealing *several arts* from them which he was not obliged to show them. No other persons seem to have been possessed of the same powers of observation.

Apart from these reflections, which may occur to any one reading the Records, various inconsistencies, errors, and confusion have been detected in the document by Faulmann ('*Erfind. der Buchdr.*' p. 136 *sqq.*), to which I will not now refer. Bockenheimer objects to the Records on grounds for the appreciation of which we require also a knowledge of the legal and social condition of that part of Germany where the events are said to have taken place. This knowledge I do not possess, but

will summarize some of his arguments here. He explains that the law prevailing in Gutenberg's time did not allow the advocacy or representation of Claus Dritzehen by his brother George, as only minors or persons declared incapable of managing their own affairs could plead through a representative. Moreover, the heirs of a deceased partner cannot claim admission into an association made with their testator. According to general principles a partnership ends by the death of one of the partners, and at its termination, the properties and relations of the associates are to be taken into account. Hence, Roman Law, appreciating this personal aspect of a contract, forbids the admission of heirs as such into an association, even if such admission had been reserved at the conclusion of the agreement. In the present plaint such a reservation, however, is not mentioned. But even if admission had been possible, no suit could have been brought against Gutenberg alone; he could not have been summoned as representative of his partners; nor could a verdict against him have affected the other partners. Gutenberg, without the consent of his associates, had no power to admit any one into the partnership, nor could he be forced to such an action by any judicial verdict.

The second part of the plaint is also suspicious. After the dissolution of an association the plaint is to be directed to an inventory of the common property and to the repayment of each partner's proportionate share. If the association has worked profitably, each partner receives his share of the profits over and above his capital invested; if it is dissolved



with loss, each partner must take his share in the burdens. In neither case can the plaintiff demand a repayment of the invested capital. Least of all was such a plaintiff possible if, as Gutenberg pleaded in his answer, the deceased had invested no capital at all in the association. But even if the plaintiff for a repayment of invested capital had been permissible, Gutenberg would have had no right to make this repayment from the cash of the association; the other associates in combination with him had to be proceeded against if the association had to repay the capital share.

In his reply to the plaintiff Gutenberg refers to a document drawn up at the conclusion, and containing the conditions of the association. The partnership was to last for five years, and if within this period one of the partners should happen to die, then the whole art, the whole apparatus, and all the work made should belong to the survivors, under condition that at the end of the five years they should pay the heirs of the deceased an indemnification of 100 guilders. The five years had not yet expired when the suit was brought before the court; it was, therefore, apart from all other defects, *too early*. Had Gutenberg on this ground demanded the non-suiting of the plaintiffs, the tribunal would have had to comply with his demand. But in such a case he would have had no opportunity of acting towards Dritzehen in a manner which could be used to the advantage of the history of printing. He was, therefore, painted as a considerate, fair defendant, and an explanation put into his mouth which not only allowed the plaintiffs to be



protected against being non-suited, but enabled the court to impose payment of a small amount on the defendant. Hence, first of all Gutenberg submitted to being saddled with the debts of the association, and to abandon his right of exception to the premature plaint. Secondly, as a partial set-off to the 100 guilders which he would have to pay according to the agreement, he claimed the payment of 85 guilders which he had the right to demand from the deceased as a premium of apprenticeship in several arts concealed even from the tribunal.

Now Gutenberg placed himself in this unfavourable position without necessity. He could claim 85 guilders from Dritzehen's heirs, and the latter had no right to make a set-off of the 100 guilders named in the contract, as the time for this payment had not yet come. But instead of receiving his 85 guilders, Gutenberg was made a debtor for 15 guilders, if he, as happened here, took upon him the debt of the association, which did not concern him at all, and took no exception to the premature plaint. How he would receive from the association the money which he allowed to be debited to him, would be his affair.

Bockenheimer further points out (p. 45) that Gutenberg, when he made an agreement with Hanns Riffe, gave him one-third share, and retained two-thirds for himself. Afterwards, being pressed by Andr. Dritzehen and Andreas Heilmann, he accepted them also as partners, and, without considering Riffe's interest, and without asking his consent, deprived him of part of his share and gave him only a quarter. He himself also, without

apparently any compensation in another way, handed over a part of the share which he had reserved for himself, and retained for the future only half, whereas the new partners received only one-eighth each.

As regards the hearing of the witnesses, Bockenheimer (p. 49) contends that a series of mistakes against the generally acknowledged principles of law which obtained in the fifteenth century, justifies us in assuming that this lawsuit of 1439 could hardly have taken place before the great Council of Strassburg. And the suspicion that the documents recording it are a forgery becomes a certainty when we examine the testimonies of the witnesses, said to have been discovered five years after the finding of the sentence.

Why, he asks, did the Court order witnesses to be examined when the affair was clear from a legally drawn up document? Neither the right of the plaintiff to the eventual payment of an indemnity, nor the right of the defendant to a tuition-fee, could, in presence of such a document, be in dispute. But, considering that evidence was demanded and to be produced, not for the amusement of the disputants, but to enlighten the Court, it remains inexplicable why the latter should have taken the trouble to summon or hear thirty-nine witnesses, and then lay their testimonies aside as of no value. A weighing of the evidence would have been desirable, if its production was considered necessary. And in this case there was a special reason for examining the testimonies of the witnesses, as they were very often contradictory to each other. Yet

the Court took no account whatever of the witnesses. For what purpose were the witnesses examined? Apparently, to enquire about the contents of the *contract* made between Gutenberg and his associates. But if the Court regarded the document of the contract as proof, the history of its origin was of no value; or if they discarded the document, then they had to look for another basis of their decision. The Court, however, did not take the latter step, but accepted the document as proof.

The view that was taken of the making of the contract, was also taken with regard to its being carried out. The witnesses were, for no purpose, examined regarding Andreas Dritzehen's contributions to the association, whereas they were, even if proved, valueless for the decision of the Court. These alleged contributions were not in question, but the indemnification agreed upon.

It is impossible to do full justice to Bockenheimer's arguments without translating his treatise, which cannot be done here. On p. 68 *sq.* he explains that the fabricator of the document, not knowing that the mode of legal procedure in his own time differed from that in Gutenberg's period, describes actions and events which could only have taken place after the introduction of Roman Law in 1495. I trust, however, that the above observations, which are partly his and partly my own, will be sufficient for forming an opinion as to the objections raised against the Lawsuit of 1439.

J. H. HESSELS.

*(To be concluded.)*

## RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

**M**RENÉ DOUMIC'S criticisms usually strike some new note, and his treatment of George Sand in his lately published volume on the great novelist is distinctly fresh and stimulating. He demonstrates how deeply the various experiences of her life influenced her work, and how closely the two are bound together. All the new ideas of her time entered into her receptive mind, every novelty, every chimera attracted her, so that her work is in fact a repertory of ideas. She had something to say on most subjects, but notably, perhaps, on love, marriage, the family, social institutions, and forms of government.

It is a dangerous proceeding, as a rule, to divide a literary genus into its different species. But custom permits us to refer to historical, or romantic, or realistic novels. Perhaps, then, following M. Doumic, we may put all novels into two great divisions: personal novels and impersonal novels. Balzac, to take an example from French literature, is one of the great representatives of the latter class. His was the realistic art in which the artist sinks his own personality and forgets himself in the characters he describes. George Sand's novels, on the other hand, are personal novels and belong to the idealistic art, in which the artist transforms the

characters he describes in accordance with his own desires. At times, so personal is the note, George Sand almost seems to be a lyric poet who has unconsciously strayed into prose. Every experience, every episode of her life, the influence of the various persons with whom she came into contact is reflected in her work. Into it she put her adventures, her sufferings, her errors, her disappointments, her dreams as an artist and as a woman. Her unhappy marriage led her to write feminist novels, the episodes with De Musset and Chopin, romantic novels, her friendship with Pierre Leroux, socialistic novels, and so on.

In 1831 George Sand came to Paris in revolt against marriage, because her own matrimonial experiences were not happy, and in the next three years wrote three novels, 'Indiana,' 'Valentine,' and 'Jacques,' setting forth in the first two cases the woes of the 'femme incomprise,' and in the last of the 'homme incompris.' These early novels, although not to be placed, perhaps, among her best work, have a great interest just now, because they are really feminist novels, and contain the whole programme of the most advanced feminists of the present time. The woman's right to be happy in her own way, the necessity of reform in the marriage laws, the introduction of the 'union libre,' and kindred matters are treated by her as they are by the woman novelists of to-day. The only difference is that where George Sand is lyrical her descendants are cynical. Some may argue that Madame de Staël originated the feminist novel with Delphine and Corinne. But Madame de Staël's 'femmes incomprises' are

always women of genius who in actual life are few and far between, whereas George Sand's heroines are women who do not love their husbands; thus, the later writer brought feminism within the reach of a much larger number of women.

George Sand's first great book was 'Mauprat.' It is a beautiful love story without any thesis, set against a background of the rural France George Sand knew and loved, and of Paris in the last days of the 'ancien régime.' With that book she gained a place in the front rank of great story-tellers.

But whether or not the world still reads 'Mauprat,' so long as the French language endures it will continue to read 'La Mare au Diable,' 'Les Maîtres Sonneurs,' 'La petite Fadette,' and 'François le Champi.' It is of her rustic novels, in which she depicts the life of the French peasant, somewhat idealized, it may be, but true, nevertheless, that George Sand's latest critic says:

'C'est la Fontaine dans quelques—unes de ses fables, c'est Perrault dans ses contes. George Sand a sa place dans cette lignée parmi les Homères français.'

Doumic concludes with an estimate of George Sand's place among French novelists, and puts it very high indeed, for he believes that the function of the novel as conceived by her is to charm, move, and console. It may be that in the future, literature, for those who know something of life, will be the great consoler. George Sand once wrote to Flaubert, 'You make your readers sad; I want to make mine less unhappy.' She certainly put into her novels the poetry that was in her soul; she sang

## RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 291

in them a hymn to nature, to love, to kindness; her books satisfy the romantic tendencies that in varying degrees are present in each of us.

It is early days yet to form an estimate of the place in French letters of François Coppée, and the modern fashion of publishing the biography of a celebrated man directly he is dead does not always help his reputation. And although I venture to think that M. Doumic is right in his treatment of George Sand in the book described above, this fashion of explaining an author's works by his life has its dangers. It has been truly said that the artist is not he who has felt more, but he who is the best endowed to imagine states of feeling and to give them expression. In 'François Coppée, L'homme et le poète (1842-1908),' Henri Schoen seeks to explain Coppée's work by his life. M. Schoen knew Coppée well, and claims to understand the historical and psychological sources of his poetry, and therefore to be in a position to throw fresh light on his inmost feelings. By this method, according to M. Schoen, Coppée's lyrics are presented as something that has actually been lived, and so take on a fresh charm. The work of art becomes a moving confession, the soul of the poet seems to speak to our soul. But surely such is always the appeal made by lyric poetry worthy of its name. If the appeal is not spontaneous, if biography, and autobiography, and a friend's commentaries must accompany it, its value as art is diminished. For in reading poetry, we are primarily concerned with it as art, and not as some particular individual's personal experience. But



## 292 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

for those who like and desire such commentary, M. Henri Schoen's book testifies to Coppée's sincerity and to the elevation of his ideas.

'Madame, Mère du Régent,' Mme. Arvède Barine's posthumous work (her death, which we all greatly deplore, occurred when only the last chapter remained to be written), is a most diverting volume, and written with all the charm and brilliance of which Mme. Barine was mistress. Indeed, the heroine is a figure of such originality that the book might be a novel, and did we not know that 'Madame' spent her life in writing letters to the relatives she knew as well as to those she never saw, to her friends, her acquaintances, her men of business, indeed, as she herself expresses it, to 'all who came her way,' we should certainly put her down to be a character of her biographer's invention. As a young woman, 'Madame' divided her time between her inkstand and the pleasures or 'the exactions' of the court of Louis XIV. As the years went on her correspondence absorbed more and more of her time: she wrote ten to twelve letters a day, each filling twenty to thirty sheets of the enormous letter paper then in vogue. They were despatched by all the methods that offered, and two or three pages were specially employed to carry them short distances,—to St. Cloud or Versailles.

It is on these letters that Mme. Barine's narrative is based, and we may safely say that the 'Mère du Régent' is the one historical personage about whom there can be very little more to know. She was, strangely enough, considering her position as

regards French history, the most German of the Germans, and of a character absolutely impervious to foreign influences. The daughter and granddaughter of two Electors Palatine of the Rhine, she was brought up at the little court of Heidelberg, amid continual domestic storms and brawls, which increased in severity when her father, tiring of his legitimate spouse, brought a second to dwell under the same roof as the first, and determined to live in a sort of official polygamy. His daughter's marriage with Monsieur, the brother of the king of France, offered a dazzling prospect for a dowryless princess, with a trousseau scandalously lacking in even most necessary under-garments.

Mme. Barine gives a series of vivacious and at the same time accurate pictures of life in the circle of the great king for whom Madame preserved to the end of her days a sort of sentimental affection, deep enough, at any rate, to make her loathe Mme. de Maintenon.

The book, too, is a valuable document for the manners and customs of the fine ladies and gentlemen of Louis XIV.'s court. The princess, although herself a pattern of virtue, indulges in her letters in incredible indecencies of language, and relates, with scarcely an apology to her correspondents, stories that are unfit for polite ears.

\* \* \* \* \*

At a time when fresh theatrical developments are interesting the public mind, and when various repertory theatres are in the air, it is opportune to consider the question of the scenery and staging of

plays. A book recently issued by Joczsa Savits, for many years director of the Shakespeare-Bühne at Munich, gives an admirable exposition of the whole subject from the point of view of one whose opinion it is that in the representation of poetical drama, the less scenery the better. Savits advocates, basing his views on the authority of the great æsthetic critics of all times and all lands, the performance, for instance, of Shakespeare's plays on a stage of similar construction to that for which the great dramatist wrote. He does not believe, however, that Shakespeare composed his plays to suit the stage that happened to exist in his time, but that he deliberately arranged them as he desired they should be produced, without the adventitious aid of mechanical artifices. For he must have known that such mechanical aids were available from the elaborate way in which masques were presented.

But, notwithstanding modern improvements, such as electricity and the revolving stage, the mechanical art of the theatre is in itself merely cords, and rags, and straps, and painted canvas, and soulless machinery. It cannot of itself ensure poetic or human treatment, or express or represent poetic or human emotion. It is in fact a real obstacle to the presentation of poetic drama; it hinders the natural course of the action so that cause and effect may not be separated. How greatly Shakespeare gains from simplification of staging was proved by the recent admirable performances of five plays given at the Court Theatre without scenery by Mr. Gerald Lawrence and Miss Fay Davis, and their accomplished and competent company. I do not know

that I have ever heard Shakespeare's language and meaning more satisfactorily interpreted. If the presentation of Shakespearian drama in this fashion became the rule, the commentator's occupation would be gone.

Savits attacks the modern custom of long pauses between the acts filled with music. In the best German theatres there is no music, and only one brief pause about the middle of the play. Savits declares that music should never be permitted, not even when specially composed by a great musician, as in the case of Beethoven's music for Goethe's 'Egmont,' and Mendelssohn's for the 'Midsummer Night's Dream.' Such interpolations act as a disturbance to the harmony and unity of the whole. He also attacks the remodelling and re-arranging of Shakespeare's plays to suit the supposed exigencies of the modern stage and a modern audience, and considers such procedure should be inadmissible even when it emanates from great poets. And he makes here a very pertinent comparison. He asks what would be thought if a modern painter like Böcklin or Klinger (he naturally takes German examples) set to work to 'paint up' or 'paint out' parts of one of Michael Angelo's great pictures because those portions were considered too grotesque or too little suited to present-day ideas.

It is not possible to go here into all the arguments put forth by Savits in support of his plea for a simplification of scenery. But the book should be read and carefully studied by all who are contemplating the sadly needed reform of our theatre. He pertinently illustrates his point by analysing the manner

in which the 'Midsummer Night's Dream' is now usually given on the German stage, alas! as well as on the English. The lion's share of importance is given to Mendelssohn's music; next comes the elaborate and really beautiful and artistic scenery; next attractive and charmingly composed ballets; and last, not the play, but only as much of it as the music, scenery, and dancing has left time for. As a rule, this is little beyond the comic scenes, those of the lovers and of the fairies are miserably curtailed, so that the impression left on the mind is generally one of exaggerated farce and burlesque. All this has necessarily a very injurious effect on the actors, who have to come into competition with the music, and painting, and dancing, and machinery, and effects of lighting, and who are forced to exaggerate in order to be distinguished from their setting: delicate nuances of tone and gesture would be lost, and so art becomes falsified and poetry banished. The book is indeed an eloquent plea for a return to simpler methods more in accord with true art and poetry.

'Stendhal et l'Angleterre,' by Doris Gannell, with a preface by Monsieur Ad. Paupe, is a very interesting contribution to the study of comparative literature. It is the thesis presented by an Englishwoman for her doctor's degree at the University of Paris. Stendhal was, of course, often in England, and was acquainted with Byron, and Hobhouse, and Lord Brougham, and Lady Morgan, and others. He also wrote a great deal on our politics, social conditions, manners, character, and literature. But what this book specially brings out is his

extraordinary indebtedness as a writer of romantic novels to Scott. Miss Gannell prints parallel passages from 'Stendhal' and from Scott that form most striking evidence of the influence on him of the English writer.

Henry Bordeaux, the novelist, has collected in a volume some of his critical essays under the title of 'Portraits de femmes et d'enfants.' He thinks that women and children are easier to describe than men, as they are less complicated. The preface is in some ways the most interesting portion of the book, for he says there something of the art of the novelist. He considers the novelist's art to stand to-day at the head of all the literary arts. Other literary 'genres' receive a frame which the artist must fill, but the novelist who has the choice of the most diverse elements, makes his own frame to suit his subject. The novel may contain everything: autobiography, metaphysics, realism, and poetry. The essays on the Comtesse de Boigne and on Madame de Charrière are excellent accounts in brief of their careers, and may be recommended to those who have neither the time nor the inclination to read their memoirs in full. Among the other subjects are Mlle. de Lespinasse and Mistral's childhood.

In 'La Littérature Féminine d'Aujourd'hui,' Jules Bertaut criticises the work of some contemporary French women writers. He discusses the way in which they conceive women, men, children, external nature, and comes to the conclusion that they have little taste, no skill in the choice of the materials life presents to them, and in spite of the

## 298 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

brilliance and picturesqueness of their style, no merit in composing. But he looks forward to a better condition of things: 'Ce vertige de la liberté nouvellement acquise que ressentent ces anciennes prisonnières ne durera pas,' and then the harmony, so characteristic of the French temperament, will enter into their work, they will obey literary rules, discipline their taste, and adopt a method.

The story of Charlotte Stieglitz, that curious tragedy of romanticism, is told in greater detail than ever before by Ernest Seillière in 'Une tragédie d'amour au temps du Romantisme. Henri et Charlotte Stieglitz (avec des documents inédits).' Charlotte was a sort of 'détraquée' Alceste. She committed suicide in order that such an event might awake her husband's soul, and enable him to produce great works. But, alas! the sacrifice was in vain, for Stieglitz remained as ordinary and common-place as before. Charlotte's act was doubtless due to the influence of literature on life, and a proof that the 'Sorrows of Werter' and similar books may have on those who fail to regard them as works of literary art, as pernicious an effect as penny dreadfuls on our hooligans.

Two books have come my way which illustrate the sort of mild eccentricity in writing that prevails among certain coteries at present both in France and Germany: 'Der Kindergarten,' by Richard Dehmel, and 'Vingt poèmes en prose,' by Marcel de Malherbe. Of the first I shall say no more than that the poet describes it as poems, games, and stories for children and parents of every sort. From the second I will quote a few sentences



from one of the poems in prose, entitled 'The Balcony':

'Une lumière de lune. Le silence. Le soir. Un balcon est là, inondé de clarté saillant sur l'atmosphère, laissant tomber au sol son ombre quadrangulaire. Des balustres l'ajournent, lui donnent un aspect léger. La muraille derrière s'élève à sa suite. Une fenêtre baille. Au delà, c'est le mystère. En deçà, l'apothéose nocturne.'

And so on, for a page or two. It is not easy to detect the poetry in so much prose.

French or German novels of interest have been sadly to seek of late. Léon de Tinseau's 'Sur les deux rives' is a rather dull tale of an aristocratic French family forced by pecuniary misfortunes to emigrate to Canada. It illustrates the tendency, however, of contemporary French novelists to seek foreign settings for their tales.

In 'Les Unis' Edouard Rod describes a family named Verrès, in which the children imitate their parents' example and follow their 'unis,' that is, adopt the 'union libre,' and dispense with the sanction of church or state. The novelist shows the difficulties attendant on such action in the present social conditions, and after going through much tribulation, the 'unis' are forced to return to the ways of ordinary folk.

Gerhart Hauptmann's new play 'Griselda' is scarcely on a level with the dramatist's best work. It is in prose, and the style at times is fine and instinct with poetical feeling. Hauptmann only follows the tale with which we are familiar in Petrarch and Chaucer and Dekker in outline. He

### 300 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

must, of course, find a psychological motive for the Count's conduct, and discovers it in his great love for his wife, which causes him to be jealous of her love for her child. It is, however, not convincing, and there is a certain ugliness in laying so much stress as the dramatist does here on the birth of the child and its precedent and attendant incidents. None of the characters are attractive or very clearly drawn.

\* \* \* \* \*

The following recently published books deserve attention :—

*La Jeunesse de Benjamin Constant.* 1767-94.  
Par Gustave Rudler.

A long, detailed work, the result of four years' labour, in which Constant is treated as a psychological type, and his life as a spiritual drama, during which he passes from the ideas of the eighteenth century to those of the nineteenth.

*Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.* Par Joseph Vianey.

A study in comparative literature dealing with Italian influences on a special period of French literature.

*Le Principe d'équilibre et le concert européen de la paix de Westphalie à l'acte d'Algésiras.* Par Charles Dupuis.

A study of politics to prove the truth of the saying: 'Les questions internationales sont avant tout des questions morales.'

*Le duel de Jarnac et de La Chatagneraie, d'après une relation contemporaine et officielle.* Par Alfred Franklin.

## RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE. 301

An interesting piece of French history as illustrated by the 'vie intime' of the period. The duel originated in a quarrel between two ladies; but, without either foreseeing it or desiring it, the two antagonists found themselves representing, the one Catholicism, and the other the Reformation. Hence the importance of the event.

**La Hongrie Rurale. Sociale et politique. Par le Comte Joseph de Mailáth. Avec une préface de René Henry.**

Deals with rural life and agrarian problems in Hungary and also with aspects of socialism there.

**Correspondance inédite de l'Empéreur Alexandre et de Bernadotte pendant l'année 1812. Publiée par X.**

The editor is a great admirer of Napoleon.

**L'Amiral de Coligny. La maison de Chatillon et la révolte protestante 1519-72. Par Charles Merki.**

**Le Berceau d'une dynastie. Les premiers Romanov, 1613-82. Par K. Waliszewski.**

Another of the interesting studies of Russian history, so many of which we owe to this author. The volume concludes the series 'Les origines de la Russie Moderne,' and the cycle of more detailed monographs from Ivan the Terrible to Catherine the Great.

**Le dernier effort de La Vendée (1832). D'après des documents inédits. Par le Vicomte A. de Courson.**

One of those minute and detailed narratives that serve for the making of larger history.

**Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Von Adolf Bartels. 2 vols. 6th edition.**

Of the eight books four deal with the nineteenth century. A chapter on the after-influences of the authors is added to each book.

302 RECENT FOREIGN LITERATURE.

Bibliothèques. Essai sur le développement des bibliothèques publiques et de la librairie dans les deux mondes. Par Eugène Morel.

A useful book of reference, although in some cases the information supplied is meagre. Its chief usefulness is, perhaps, that it takes in a large variety of countries. It contains a good deal of criticism on the English custom of borrowing books.

ELIZABETH LEE.

## EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

**T**HE innumerable MSS., chiefly papyri, discovered during the last thirty or forty years in the sands of Egypt have, as is well known, added enormously to our knowledge of the life and literature of the ancient world. Besides what we may call their internal value, the new literary works or early texts of known works and the many documents illustrating the organization and daily life of Hellenistic Egypt which they include, they throw much light upon the external forms of ancient MSS. We are enabled to trace the progress of the Greek alphabet from the fourth century B.C. to the eighth century of our era; and we see, too, how the books of the ancient world were reproduced and prepared for general circulation. As most of the papyri are rolls, it is chiefly this form which the discoveries illustrate; but a considerable number of codices have also been recovered, and a brief account of the methods of binding in use at the period to which these belong may perhaps be of interest to a wider circle than the small number of persons interested in papyrology. For a fuller treatment of the subject reference may be made to the third chapter of W. Schubart's 'Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern' (Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1907), and much use has been made of this in the present article;

### 304 EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

but the British Museum possesses a considerable amount of useful material not available to Schubart, particularly in the so-called Aphrodito Papyri. These papyri are official documents of the early eighth century A.D., and consist largely of taxation accounts, most of which are in codex form.

It will perhaps be well to explain that papyrus as writing material was prepared by laying together strips of the pith of the stem of the papyrus plant in double layers. The top layer was laid at right angles to the bottom one, and the two, stuck together with glue, were then pressed and polished for use. Thus, on one side of a sheet of papyrus the fibres were perpendicular, on the other horizontal. To form a roll a number of sheets (known as *κολλήματα*) were fastened together. The side on which the fibres were horizontal was slightly better suited to writing, and was therefore the one used for that purpose. It is always known as the recto, the other as the verso. Generally speaking, only one side of a roll was used; but there are many instances of rolls used on the verso as well, and it is clear that the perpendicular fibres were no serious impediment to easy writing.

The origin of the codex is probably to be found in the wax tablets used as note-books. These were fastened together in sets; and thus, it may be assumed, the idea was suggested of using in the same way sheets of papyrus or vellum, which, being much thinner, were more compact. It is possible that at first single sheets were used, on the analogy of the tablets, but if so no specimens seem to have survived, and the practice was soon adopted, if it

## EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT. 305

did not obtain from the first, of doubling the sheets. Thus each sheet makes two leaves or four pages. It seems clear that vellum preceded papyrus as a material for codices. Considerably after the introduction of the vellum codex the traditional roll form continued to be the usual one for papyri; and, indeed, the habit of using the papyrus on only one side, whereas vellum was equally convenient on either side, made it natural to adopt the latter rather than the former for the codex. It is certain from references in ancient authors that at first, curiously enough, vellum was regarded as an inferior material to papyrus, and was used chiefly for note-books or the cheap and 'popular' editions of literary works.<sup>1</sup> If this was the case even in Rome, it was naturally still more so in Egypt, the seat of the papyrus manufacture, and the roll continued to be the chief form for editions or the classics down to at least the fourth century A.D. There are, however, a few classical codices of earlier date; for example, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 34473 (1), a fragment of a vellum codex of Demosthenes, probably of the second century A.D.; a leaf at Berlin from a vellum codex of the 'Cretans' of Euripides ('Berliner Klassikertexte,' V., 2, p. 73), which the editors assign to the first century; and Oxy. Papp. 459 and 873,<sup>2</sup> fragments respectively of papyrus codices of Demosthenes and Hesiod, of the third century. In the case of theological literature the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kenyon, 'Palæography of Greek Papyri,' p. 113, Schubart, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> 'The Oxyrhynchus Papyri,' edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, 6 vols.



### 306 EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

codex, whether of vellum or papyrus, was probably the prevailing form from the outset; a fact to be explained partly by the poverty of the early Christian communities, whose sole care would be to preserve their Scriptures, without regard to elegance of form, and partly by the great saving of space of which the codex, as contrasted with the roll, permits. The tradition once established, it was natural that it should continue even when the Christians had grown in numbers and importance; but, indeed, by that time the codex was already beginning to oust the roll even for classical authors.

Vellum, it has been said above, was probably adopted before papyrus as the material for codices, and it might have been expected that it would be the sole material, papyrus continuing to be made up as rolls till the final victory of the codex; but the influence of the vellum codex led to the adoption of papyrus also, and codices in this material make their appearance, as already said, even for classical authors, as early as the third century, when the roll was still the prevailing form. Schubart, indeed, in the book already referred to (p. 102), infers from an inscription at Priene the existence of papyrus codices in Asia Minor as early as the first century B.C. By the fourth century the papyrus codex was fully established, and it continued in use till at least the eighth century.

The priority of the roll form has exerted some influence on the codex. Thus, in B. M. Pap. 126, a codex of the Iliad, the scribe used only one side of the papyrus, as he would have done with a roll, so that half the pages were left blank. Some of

## EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT. 307

them have subsequently been used to receive a grammatical treatise of Tryphon. Again, it is perhaps to the influence of the roll that we may assign the practice, seen in several codices, of writing more than one column on each page. Schubart, indeed, questions the connection of this with the roll form, and points out that it is found in some codices of a comparatively late date; but the practice, once established, might continue for a considerable time, and it is not unlikely that a scribe used to writing on rolls might, on finding that a column of the usual breadth left a considerable part of the page blank, fill up the remainder with a second column or more. It is noticeable that the early vellum codex B. M. Add. MS. 34473 (1) has two columns to the page, and the Codex Sinaiticus of the Bible (early fifth century) has four. Thus, when opened, it shows eight successive columns, and has in fact quite the appearance of a roll. Two columns have, of course, been common in later times.

The codex, it has been said, was composed of a number of folded sheets, each forming two leaves, or four pages; but it was possible to make these up in various ways. The simplest form is in quires of one folded sheet only, and this is seen fairly often. An early instance is B. M. Pap. 46 (fourth century). It is the almost invariable rule in the eighth century Aphrodito papyri, which, though only account-books, are in many cases composed of papyrus of fine quality, and carefully written. Another common form is quires of two sheets, making four leaves, or eight pages. An instance is the great

### 308 EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

Aristophanes papyrus codex ('Berl. Klassikertexte,' V., 2, p. 99, *circ.* fifth century), one page of which has at the top, on the left, Θ *i.e.* 9; on the right, ΞΕ *i.e.* 65. It is clear that 9 is the number of the quire, 65 that of the page; consequently, eight quires of eight pages each must have preceded, which gives a quire of two sheets. Again, B. M. Add. MS. 34473 (7), a double sheet (probably of the seventh century), is paged 32, 33, 38, 39. A double sheet must therefore have come in the middle, forming a quire of two sheets. A papyrus codex, probably of the sixth century, published by J. H. Bernard in 'The Transactions of the Royal Academy,' Vol. XXIX., Part XVIII., consists of quires of four sheets, *i.e.* sixteen pages; and the same arrangement was probably adopted with the famous papyrus codex of Menander (fifth century?) discovered in 1905 at Kom Ishgau.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, Amh. Pap. 1<sup>2</sup> ('The Ascension of Isaiah') of the fifth or sixth century, consisted of quires of six sheets or twelve leaves.

The advantages of the small quire are so obvious that one would expect it to have been adopted from the first; but there are several instances of books formed of a single quire of many sheets. One instance is B. M. Pap. 126 (probably third century), a MS. of the Iliad, which at present contains nine sheets or eighteen leaves, all of one quire; and another is Oxy. Pap. 208 (now B. M. Pap. 782), also

<sup>1</sup> Cf. too, W. E. Crum, 'Catalogue of the Coptic MSS. in the British Museum,' Nos. 12 and 940.

<sup>2</sup> 'The Amherst Papyri,' 2 vols., edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, 1900, 1901.

of the third century.<sup>1</sup> The last-mentioned is a sheet of two leaves which the contents show to have been almost the outermost sheet of a quire of twenty-five sheets. The disadvantages of quires so large are obvious. They involved a considerable waste of papyrus, since the larger the quire the greater the space which was lost by doubling. If, too, the columns of writing were at all near to the inner side of the page, the book, when bound, must have been very inconvenient to read. Thus, in Oxy. Pap. 208 just referred to, which, as already said, must have been one of the outermost sheets of the quire, the space between the two columns which occupy the opposite pages is only three-quarters of an inch. As most of the books of this type are fairly early in date, it has been supposed that the practice was due to want of acquaintance with the codex form, and the editors of the Oxyrhynchus papyri remark of Pap. 208 that it is 'the simpler and more primitive form.' B. M. Pap. 1419,<sup>2</sup> however, which is one of the Aphroditō Papyri, and contains a protocol bearing the name of the Arab Governor 'Abd-al-Malik b. Rifā'a and dated in the fifteenth indiction (A.D. 716-17), is also of this form. Incomplete at present, it still consists of thirty-three leaves, representing seventeen sheets, of which two are single sheets of one leaf each; and the whole forms one quire.

<sup>1</sup> A similar MS. is that described by K. Schmidt in 'Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Akad.,' 1907, p. 154 ff. This is a book of eighty-eight pages or forty-four leaves, and is assigned by the editor to the second half of the fourth century.

<sup>2</sup> This is the catalogue number; the inventory number is 1442.

### 310 EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

In books of every kind it is not uncommon to find a single sheet, consisting of only one leaf or two pages, used occasionally in place of the usual double sheet of two leaves or four pages; there are several examples of this in the Aphrodito Papyri. In binding the quires together, they were usually laid one above another after being folded, and the whole then pierced through both leaves, the cord being passed through the holes; this was usually done at top and bottom and in the middle. Thus, each double sheet, when laid out flat, has six corresponding holes, three on each side. For cord, the binders of the Aphrodito Papyri used bands of papyrus. In Amh. Pap. 1 already referred to a strip of vellum was inserted above the cord in the centre of the quire to prevent it from tearing the papyrus. It was the rule, in making up quires, to let the recto of the papyrus face to the middle, so that the four pages of each double sheet were arranged, as regards the papyrus, verso, recto, recto, verso; and this rule was observed even with single sheets, which were turned towards the middle of the book. There are several exceptions to the rule,<sup>1</sup> but it is consistently observed in the Aphrodito Papyri, except in one case in B. M. Pap. 1419, five consecutive sheets of which were bound with the verso facing to the middle. As the Aphrodito Papyri are amongst the latest Greek papyri yet discovered, we may perhaps take it that the rule, at first uncertain, became more firmly established in course of time.

In many cases no numeration of pages or quires

<sup>1</sup> See Schubart, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

## EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT. 311

was given; sometimes the quires but not the pages were numbered, and sometimes both. The sizes of books varied greatly. A leaf of a vellum codex containing an uncanonical gospel, which was published by Grenfell and Hunt as Oxy. Pap. 840, measures only  $3\frac{3}{8}$  in. x  $2\frac{3}{4}$  in. The usual size was, of course, far larger; and in one of the Aphrodito Papyri, B. M. Pap. 1414,<sup>1</sup> the leaves, none of which is complete, seem to have measured originally at least 1 ft. x 2 in. x 2 ft. x 5 in.

In conclusion, a few words may be said concerning the employment of the so-called 'protocols' in the case of codices, and also concerning the bindings. The manufacture of papyrus was a Government monopoly, and in Byzantine and Arab times each roll of it was guaranteed by certain formulæ written (very illegibly) at the beginning of the roll, and known as a protocol. No Byzantine protocol has yet been satisfactorily deciphered; those of the early Arab period bore the Mohammedan formulæ in Greek and Arabic, and the name of the Khalif or Governor, or both. The rolls, as already explained, were composed of a number of sheets or *κολλήματα*, so arranged that the recto of each faced the same way; but an exception was made to this rule in the case of the *κόλλημα*, which was to contain the protocol. This was always affixed in the reverse way, the consequence being that the protocol was written on the verso, the text on the recto, of the papyrus. When papyrus was used for codices, the protocol occupied the first leaf, facing to the middle of the book; thus, the first page was blank, or, in

<sup>1</sup> The catalogue number.

### 312 EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT.

some cases, bore a heading descriptive of the contents of the book, the second contained the protocol, and on the third (folio 2) the book proper began. The protocol was still affixed the reverse way to the other *κολλήματα*, so that the pages of the first leaf were arranged, not, as usual, verso, recto, but recto, verso. Protocols were attached not only to codices containing accounts and other official documents, like the Aphrodito Papyri, but to literary works also; an example is No. 171 (a collection of homilies) in Crum's 'Catalogue of the Coptic MSS. in the British Museum.'

Several ancient bindings are preserved. One is that of the book just referred to, which, as the protocol belongs to the Byzantine period, was probably not later than the middle of the seventh century; but the binding may, of course, be later than the book itself. Another early binding, the earliest which can quite certainly be dated,<sup>1</sup> is that of B. M. Pap. 1419, which has a protocol dated in A.D. 716-17, and of which the binding was certainly contemporary with the book. Bindings were usually of leather, which in most cases was backed with papyrus and bore a pattern. That of Crum's No. 171 is a somewhat elaborate one, the pattern being stamped on the leather; the form of the binding is the same as that of our modern books. B. M. Pap. 1419 is more interesting because

<sup>1</sup> The binding of the book referred to in the note on p. 309, is probably older, as the book is assigned by Schmidt to the fourth century; but here again we cannot be certain that the binding was contemporary with the book. Literary or theological texts would be preserved a considerable time, and might be rebound.



## EARLY CODICES FROM EGYPT. 313

more primitive. The pattern, which appears on both covers, seems not to have been stamped, but to have been drawn with ink or paint. The front cover has a flap, overlapping the back cover, and the book was not laid flat between the covers, as with us, but doubled, as might be done with a newspaper in a portfolio. This may well have been the original form, that of the Coptic MS. referred to and of later books being a subsequent development.

H. I. BELL.

## SHAKESPEARE, AND THE SCHOOL OF ASSUMPTION.<sup>1</sup>

**W**E opened this book, which is a small one of some 150 pages, with a keen sense of coming enjoyment, for the first thing to meet our eyes was a pair of monumental portraits labelled respectively 'William Shakespeare' and 'Francis Bacon,' and both transfigured. Then we felt we were in for a treat indeed—Mark Twain on the Bacon-Shakespeare craze. What a field for the old humorist of our younger days, whom we all loved and laughed with. What a chance for us, to hear his quips and cranks rattling on the funny people who have persuaded themselves that Shakespeare's Works were written by somebody else of the same or some other name. In the first page of the text, however, we found something to give us pause, for there, classed with 'claimants historically notorious,' we read 'Satan, Claimant; the Golden Calf, Claimant; the Veiled Prophet of Khorassan, Claimant; Louis XVII., Claimant; William Shakespeare, Claimant; Arthur Orton, Claimant;' and others, too, but though we looked for him, never a mention of Francis Bacon, the one who has come up as a claimant for just the biggest thing in all creation.

<sup>1</sup> 'Is Shakespeare Dead?' by Mark Twain. Harper Brothers, 1909.

## THE SCHOOL OF ASSUMPTION. 315

And then we began to see a glimpse of the joke. Why, of course; what else could one expect from dear old Mark Twain? So like his old ways. And then we read on, in hope; and further on, not quite so hopeful; and after a bit, we became uneasy; and then grew uncertain; and after a while uncertainty suddenly became certainty, and we knew we had been tricked, and that the question was not 'Is Shakespeare Dead?' but, Is Mark Twain's Humour dead?—for staring us in the face was the big, bald, unwelcome truth that he had been reading with approval 'The Shakespeare Problem Restated,' coupled with an admission that he had been interested in 'that matter' ever since the appearance of Delia Bacon's book some fifty years ago. Poor unhappy Delia Bacon, who died in her young devotion to the wildest creed that ever filled the idle craniums of gullable humanity.

To convince us of his qualifications for the task he has taken in hand with so complete a confidence, Mark Twain proceeds to tell us how he and a master-pilot used to read Shakespeare together on a steamboat on the Mississippi many years ago. Both started as strong believers in the orthodox Shakespeare of Stratford, but before long a change came over the apprentice, the rock he split on being the 'lawyer talk and lawyer ways' shown by the writer of the dramas. Delia Bacon and her followers had done their deadly work; and to these enlightened authorities he eventually bowed down, taking his new position at first 'seriously,' and then 'devotedly,' and 'finally: fiercely, rabidly, uncompromisingly.' Hence this latest chapter of his autobiography—

which, as it shows him to us in a querulous, un-literary, and reviling mood, we should for his own sake gladly have done without.

One of the most melancholy features of this volume is the utter absence of any novelty in the way of argument. No *sauce piquante* is even served to flavour the old redished assertions and innuendos—and the effect is distinctly cloying to the literary palate.

Mark Twain, however, does supply us with a test for discovering whether Shakespeare did or did not write the plays and poems. It is not altogether new—very far from it—but we accept it, and not only accept it, but shall apply it to his own work, just as he bids us apply it to Shakespeare's. His contention is:

'That a man can't handle glibly and easily and comfortably and successfully the *argot* of a trade at which he has not personally served. He will make mistakes; he will not, and cannot, get the trade-phrasings precisely and exactly right; and the moment he departs by even a shade, from the common trade-form, the reader who has served that trade will know the writer *hasn't*.'

Later, with this test still in view, he says:

'I have been a quartz miner in the silver regions. . . . I know all the palaver of that business. . . . I know the *argot* of the quartz-mining and milling industry familiarly; and so, whenever Bret Harte introduces that industry into a story, the first time one of his miners opens his mouth I recognize from his phrasing that Harte got the phrasing by listening . . . not by experience. . . . I know several other trades and the *argot* that goes with them; and whenever a person tries to talk the talk peculiar

to any of them without having learned it at its source, I can trap him always before he gets far on his road.

'And so . . . if I were required to superintend a Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, I would narrow the matter down to a single question: *Was the author of Shakespeare's Works a lawyer?*—a lawyer deeply read and of limitless experience?'

Having thus laid down the conditions of his test, he proceeds to give us twenty-two pages more, taken from 'The Shakespeare Problem Restated' (but forgetting, till called to book, to mention the author's name), and he describes this somewhat long quotation as '*testimony*, so strong, so direct, so authoritative,' etc., that it quite convinces him 'that the man who wrote Shakespeare's works knew all about law and lawyers. Also that the man could not have been the Stratford Shakespeare—and *wasn't*.'

Now apply his own test. He breaks down, just as he himself describes Bret Harte breaking down. He has learned 'the argot of the trade' *from books*. His '*testimony*' is the mere *ex parte* statement of a controversialist, a controversialist, too, whose contentions have been shown to be unsound by many writers since his book appeared; but as to any practical familiarity with the difficulties that *may* or *may not* exist in connexion with Shakespeare's knowledge of the law, he stands confessed as having picked up the little he knows '*by listening*.' So far as we can gather from his book he is not even aware that nearly all the dramatists of Shakespeare's day indulge in law metaphors and terms as well as Shakespeare. He has yet to learn the curious fact that those of them who *were* lawyers

are not the ones who make most frequent use of legal phraseology; and that careful students of the subject are by no means satisfied that Shakespeare's law is invariably accurate. Nor does Mark Twain seem to be aware that much of this law is taken *verbatim* from writers such as Holinshed, and other familiar sources. This latest of anti-Shakespearians should read an admirable volume by one of the judges in his own country, Charles Allen's 'Notes on the Bacon-Shakespeare Question' (Boston and New York, 1900), which contains a particularly full chapter on this very matter. To quote but one passage from it: 'If "Hamlet's" collection of legal terms goes to show that the play was written by Bacon, the play of "All Fools" [by Chapman] must have been written by Coke himself.' But enough on this point. We would only remark in leaving it that no contemporary of Shakespeare seems to have detected any anomaly in connexion with the Stratford playwright's legal phrases—and they were not altogether without brains in those times, and were at all times only too ready to criticize, not to say pick holes in, his work whenever they had a chance to do so. The 'Baconian,' or anti-Shakespearian, if he prefer that title, makes too large a demand upon our credulity when he asks us to believe that *he* is better acquainted with the literary circumstances of the age than Ben Jonson and the many others who knew Shakespeare in the flesh, and who have recorded their opinions of both the man and his performances in language which no one but the wilfully blind can for a moment misunderstand.

When dealing with the subject of Shakespeare as a lawyer, Mark Twain of course quotes Lord Campbell's somewhat hackneyed dictum. We do not blame him for doing so—every 'Baconian' and anti-Shakespearian does so too. It is this: 'While novelists and dramatists are constantly making mistakes as to the laws of marriage, of wills, and inheritance, to Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he expounds it, there can neither be demurrer, nor bill of exceptions, nor writ of error.'<sup>1</sup>

Presumably the persons who rely on this passage have read the book from which it comes, but it is a striking fact that not one of them, so far as we are aware ever mentions Lord Campbell's views as to *how* Shakespeare's legal knowledge was acquired. Here is what he says:

'I should not hesitate to state, with some earnestness, that there has been a great deal of misrepresentation and delusion as to Shakespeare's opportunities when a youth of acquiring knowledge, and as to the knowledge he had acquired. From a love of the incredible, and a wish to make what he afterwards accomplished absolutely miraculous, a band of critics have conspired to lower the condition of his father, and to represent the son, when approaching man's estate, as still almost wholly illiterate.'

He goes on to show up the unsoundness of statements reflecting on John Shakespeare's ability to write; and then discusses the various opportunities which the poet had of learning law. He says:

'Shakespeare, during his first years in London, when his purse was low, may have dined at the ordinary in

<sup>1</sup> 'Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements.'



Alsatia . . . described by Dekker. [He quotes the well-known passage from the "Gull's Hornbook," 1609.] In such company a willing listener might soon make great progress in law.' . . .

One of his concluding passages on this subject is the following:

'We cannot argue with confidence on the principles which would guide us to safe conclusions respecting ordinary men, when we are reasoning respecting one of whom it was truly said:

'Each change of many-coloured life he drew,  
Exhausted worlds, and then imagined new;  
Existence saw him spurn her bounded reign,  
And panting Time toiled after him in vain."

Only fancy any fair-minded writer *restating* the Shakespeare problem and never mentioning these views of Lord Campbell, and much more of the same kind which is to be found in his impartial work. Yet these are the ways of Shakespeare's enemies.

If we are content to abide by the issues raised by Mark Twain the question is at once narrowed down to a very simple form: Which side indulges most in assumptions? This most up-to-date champion of 'Baconian' claims tells us that 'so far as anybody knows and can prove, Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon never wrote a play in his life.' No Mississippi pilot's understrapper could be more cocksure of his course—in *his own* mind. Whether the passengers would share his views when the voyage was over, or he in a condition to express a view at all, is of course another matter—but that

is *their* look-out. The somewhat truculent assertion we quote means one of two things, either that no one of past time can be proved to have written a play unless reliable witnesses can be produced to say they saw him do it; or, that there *is* no contemporary evidence to show that Shakespeare wrote a play. If the former be the meaning of Mark Twain's oracular announcement, it is childish, for there is no one now to say that he saw Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Plautus, Terence, or any other playwright of old time writing a play. If, however, we are to take the second alternative as the meaning, the assertion betrays so colossal an ignorance of the writings of Shakespeare's contemporaries that we can only wonder at any sane person committing himself to such egregious nonsense. More than twenty different writers who were contemporaries of the Stratford playwright refer to Shakespeare by name as either an author, a poet, a tragedian, or a comedian. Their written words show that they spoke of him from a personal knowledge of the man, or at least echoed at a very short range the belief that was shared by all the play-going and literary people of the time. The list of them includes such names as Michael Drayton, William Clerke, John Weever, Richard Carew, John Davies, Henry Willobie, Francis Meres, Richard Barnfield, Camden, Webster, Drummond, and Howes, the continuator of Stow's 'Chronicles.' But these and what they have told us are dismissed by Mark Twain with such convincing elegancies as 'a hatful of rags and a barrel of sawdust.' And yet here there is no assumption. It must surely seem strange

X.

Y

even to a 'Baconian' that no voice was heard throughout Shakespeare's lifetime to suggest the improbability, not to say the impossibility, of his being the author of what was attributed to him. After his death there were many others who had known him in his living days and who wrote of him as a man, as a playwright, as an actor, as a poet, and as one born at Stratford. Chief amongst them is Ben Jonson, whose evidence, if all other evidence had perished, would seem to be absolutely insurmountable to any but those who are wilfully impervious to testimony of the highest kind. When Mark Twain gives us some reason to think that his literary equipment is of a kind to outweigh the clearly expressed statements of one who loved the man Shakespeare, on this side idolatry, as much as any, he may cajole us to raise our caps to the pupil of Delia Bacon, and 'call truth a liar.' But inasmuch as the work under review is but a transparent *réchauffé* of a mythical system that has long ago crumbled into dust, literary opinion is not now likely to be swayed, even at the command of Mark Twain, towards a reconstruction of Elizabethan and Jacobean biography that will include Ben Jonson amongst the dishonest.

The Poems were, we know, published as by William Shakespeare, the most usual method in all ages of informing the world of authorship. Neither in his day nor in any other was it customary for an English author to go out on London Bridge, or round Paul's Cross, with the town-crier in front of him, announcing that he and no other was the writer of his works. Many of the Plays too when

printed bore his name on their title-pages. There was no whisper then heard that there was more than one William Shakespeare. No one then cried out against the man whose name stood on these title-pages as an impostor amongst the authors of the day. Even such expressions as can by any possibility be construed as uncomplimentary to him, attested his powers with even greater emphasis than the many tributes of the time to his poetical and dramatic eminence. No one then talked of his want of education, his illiterate parents, his insanitary birthplace, or puzzled his mind over the sources of his history, his classics, or his law. All this remained for the wise-acres of a later day, separated from his age by a convenient trifle of three hundred years, when the records of the time had disappeared in tons—the wise-acres who cry out against assumption, and all the while assume that the absence of much evidence after such a period is proof that none ever existed; and who, further, for some reason that nobody has yet been able to fathom, assume that such evidence as still exists is a demonstration of the contrary of the very words in which it comes to us, or that it refers at best to a visionary *nom-de-plume* adopted by some superlatively modest statesman of the courtly circle who dabbled openly in fourth-rate verses and was reluctant to appear before the public as the author of such poems as 'Venus and Adonis' and 'Lucrece.' What price assumption here?—to use a phrase that Mark Twain will understand. We can imagine even the ghost of George Washington gibbering on the uncertainty of immortality, if the evidence

of his contemporaries is to be construed in the topsy-turvy fashion that commends itself to the exponents of 'Baconianism.' Accepting such methods of reading, or obliterating, evidence, even he, national asset though he be of a great people, must go down under the assault of any scribbling calumniator who has sat as pupil at the feet of Delia Bacon and the writer of 'The Shakespeare Problem Restated.'

But let us reduce the question at issue to a concrete and practical form. Suppose a book to have been published by, say, a New York printer, having the name of Samuel Clemens as the author, dated 1867, or thereabouts. Suppose further that it so happened that the printer who brought out the volume was a native of the village of Hannibal, where Samuel Clemens was born. Suppose again that the book went through seven editions in the course of eight years after its first appearance. Would Mark Twain contend that here was no clear evidence to the world at large of authorship? Would he listen with patience to anyone who suggested years afterwards that Samuel Clemens could not have been the writer, because his early days had been spent as a pilot-apprentice on a steamboat on the Mississippi? Would it, in his eyes, make the evidence weaker if no one of the time could be produced who had uttered a word to suggest that Samuel Clemens was not capable of writing such a work? Or if persons *could* be produced who, with opportunities of knowing him, had mentioned this work as his in their writings? Yet here are literally the historical facts relating to

Shakespeare and the publication of his 'Venus and Adonis' and his 'Lucrece.'

Amongst the remarkable and 'positively known' 'facts' of Shakespeare's life, to which we are treated by the new historian of the period, is this:

'So far as any one *knows and can prove*, Shakespeare of Stratford wrote only one poem during his life:

'Good friend for Iesus sake forbear  
To dig the dust enclosed here:  
Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones  
And curst be he yt moves my bones.

'This one is authentic . . . he wrote the whole of it out of his own head.'

Of course, he does not deign to give us any proof of the 'fact,' no more than in other cases. It may accordingly interest him to hear that the best proof is a description of a visit to Stratford written by one William Hall, *seventy-eight years after Shakespeare's death*, in which he states that these verses were penned by Shakespeare to suit 'the capacity of clerks and sextons.'

If Mark Twain admits such a statement as proof, will he reject what Milton and Dryden said at even an earlier date? Or will he refuse to believe Edward Phillips who in 1675 wrote:

'William Shakespeare, the glory of the English stage; whose nativity at Stratford-upon-Avon is the highest honour that town can boast of, etc.'

Risking the ingratitude that commonly attends unasked advice, we would suggest to the writer of

<sup>1</sup> 'Theatrum Poetarum,' Pref. p. 194.

this quaint sample of fiction that he might add largely to his knowledge on the subject in question by reading the works of Francis Bacon. If he should happen to find this task more tedious than might be expected after assuming that they came from the pen of one who wrote of Falstaff, and Hamlet, and Mercutio, there is another course open to him. Let him read the life of an early Roman playwright named Plautus, whose origin was much lower than that of Shakespeare of Stratford, but whose achievements in literature and drama were quite as remarkable. When he has done with Plautus let him turn for a while to Chatterton, 'the marvellous boy,' and learn what he did—from what beginnings, with what materials, and at what age. And then let him wander nearer home and gather what light he may—and there will be much light—from a quiet perusal of the early life and ultimate position of one Abraham Lincoln. We would make one proviso, however, in case he should think it worth his while to dip into these biographies: he should *not* assume that such contemporaries as may have written about these eminent men were one and all engaged in the propagation of meaningless and ridiculous falsehoods; and, above all, he should *not* lay the flattering unction to his soul that his own ignorance of what they *have* written is not conclusive proof that they never wrote anything at all. It is a fact seriously to be deplored that the 'Baconians' who up till now have distinguished themselves by showing any penetrative and broad-minded acquaintance with the real life and language of their champion and claimant may



be counted on the fingers of a man who has lost both his arms. That Mark Twain should have enrolled himself in the ranks of these literary tatterdemalions is not an action that will add to his credit as a writer, or endear him to those who look on Shakespeare as their 'bright particular star,' and who are inclined to pin their faith to men who have devoted their life-long studies to his works and his period, rather than to others whose writings stamp them as unfamiliar with even the elementary facts and conditions of sixteenth and seventeenth century literature, and whose folly allows them to advertise their ignorance in every form of misguided presumption, dullness, and rhodomontade.

## REVIEWS.

*Æneas Silvius (Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini, Pius II.),  
Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman, and Pope.  
By William Boulting. Archibald Constable & Co.*

**M**R. BOULTING has written an interesting and sympathetic account of the gay and eloquent secretary and man of letters, who subsequently became Pope Pius II., an account all the more likely to win acceptance because while it protests against its hero being treated as a mere adventurer, it does not attempt to claim him as a saint. Born in 1405, Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini only became a deacon in 1446, and a priest in the following year. Within a few months he was made Bishop of Trieste, and in 1449 was translated to the see of Siena, his native town. In 1456 he became a cardinal, in 1458 pope. He died, worn out by diseases produced, in part at least, by his early hardships, 14th August, 1464. These dates of themselves suffice to explain the charges brought against him, and are at the same time his best justification. Although before he became one of the imperial secretaries he had successively served three bishops, he persistently refused, until he was past forty, to advance beyond the minor orders which left him at once a layman and a clerk. During these years he used as a layman a personal licence no greater than that of a very large number of ecclesiastics, but he also wrote a Latin novel and

some minor pieces which had to be repudiated with some shame when he became bishop and pope. That a man's religion and morality must be all of a piece was a doctrine very dimly apprehended in the fifteenth century. Piccolomini in his early manhood had at least his devout moments. He applied once to San Bernardino to be received as a novice, though Bernardino rejected him, with true insight into character, for did not Enea, after he was pope, dwell on the delights of a monastery—for those who could leave it when they chose? At an early stage of his diplomatic life, when his storm-tossed ship at last reached Scotland, whither he was bound on a mission, he walked barefoot through the snow to perform a vow to the Blessed Virgin. His very shrinking from orders, and the marked change in his way of life after he received them, showed what Dr. Johnson would have called 'good principles.' Emphatically he received his ecclesiastical preferments, including the papacy, not as a saint, but as a statesman and diplomatist; and the church who needed such men, and had to reward them in this way to secure their help, was no doubt spiritually the poorer for it, despite some counterbalancing gains. But that Piccolomini felt the responsibility of his offices, and opened his heart to receive the grace which he believed was given with them, there seems no psychological reason to doubt. As to the charge of treachery and self-seeking in his desertion of the Council of Basel and its anti-pope, the council, at the beginning of its long career (1431-46), held, morally and religiously, so strong a position, and at the end

so weak a one, that neither adherence nor desertion need much excuse. Piccolomini's choice of a moment was, no doubt, dictated by his desire to bring the emperor with him when he came, which is only to say that he acted as a statesman rather than a prophet. On these points, and as providing a psychologically consistent and also picturesque account of a very striking career, Mr. Boulting's biography is excellent. What students of early printed books will miss in it is a more detailed account of his hero's numerous writings. Mr. Boulting has used these for his own narrative; he gives, moreover, a general impression of his style and general characteristics. He shows his readers Æneas Sylvius, to use his literary name, as a born book-maker, who even amid the troubles of the papacy could not resist an attractive subject, with the curiosity rather than the learning of a scholar; frank to indiscretion in what he allowed his pen to write, and with the superficial vanity which is amusing and attractive rather than the reverse. A rapid sketch of this kind harmonizes well with the whole tone of Mr. Boulting's book, which is itself popular rather than scholarly. But it leaves room for a study of Æneas Sylvius as a man of letters, which we hope some one may yet be moved to write.

*Catalogue général des Incunables des bibliothèques publiques de France. Par M. Pellechet. Tome troisième. Compagnies—Gregorius Magnus. Paris, Librairie Alphonse Picard et fils.*

No welcome can be too warm for this third volume of the great catalogue of the fifteenth

century books in the public libraries of France, begun by Mlle. Pellechet and continued after her death, with many improvements, by her friend M. Louis Polain. Of all the work now being done on incunabula this is in one very important respect the most valuable, since it describes the vast majority of the extant books from the French presses of the fifteenth century, comparatively few of which were known to Hain even at second hand, while fewer still were described by him from personal knowledge. We could wish that, after the manner of the Oxford English Dictionary, M. Polain would write a little preface to each of his volumes, giving some statistics as to the number of books which it registers from each country, and how many of these had been previously undescribed. But M. Polain is too modest to give any information which would bring into relief the greatness of his work, and we shall probably have to construct tables of this kind for ourselves from the typographical index which will no doubt accompany his final volume. Here we may note that the numbered entries in this section run from 3889 to 5394, corresponding roughly to Hain 5,558 to 7,993, so that the proportion of the entries to those in Hain is about equal to 70 per cent., and taking Hain's total as something under 17,000, this catalogue when it is finished (allowing for the falling off in the last section of Hain) may be expected to comprise between 12,000 and 13,000 entries. Each of these entries comprises a description, if anything, rather more detailed than those written by Hain for the books at Munich; and in addition

to this, whether the book possesses printed signatures or not, a collation by quires, expressed in one or other of two rather bewildering fashions, but to be relied on as nearly always absolutely correct. In addition to these descriptions and collations notes are often given as to differences between copies, and occasionally as to rubricators, dates, or notes of purchase which help to fix the chronology of undated books; the types are indicated in accordance with Proctor's notation, and references are given to all available facsimiles. To catalogue twelve or thirteen thousand incunabula on this scale single-handed, even with the aid of the materials collected by Mlle. Pellechet, is a great task, and M. Polain must be warmly congratulated on the steady progress which he is making with it. We note that under his No. 4218 he catalogues the '*Dialogus inter Hugonem, Catonem et Oliuerium super libertate ecclesiastica*' of 14th June, 1477, as printed '*Reichenstenii*' by a '*typographe indéterminé*,' so that like the compilers of the British Museum catalogue of incunabula, he did not acquaint himself in time with the recent discovery that this was really printed at Cologne, with types akin to those used by Götz. Under No. 4286, again, the '*Diomedes*' of 10th March, 1494, is entered without any note that the '*Venetiiis*' of its imprint conceals the fact that, like the '*Justinus*' of the following month (H. 9652), it was really printed by L. Pachel at Milan. On the other hand M. Polain is himself constantly adding to knowledge and offering problems for the consideration of other bibliographers, as by his record of the very curious

stamped date (MCCCCLXX) in one of the copies at the Bibliothèque Nationale of the third (?) of Husner's editions of the 'Rationale Duranti.' As Husner is not known to have printed before 1473, and this edition is not in the type used in his earliest dated books, but in those found in the 'Legenda Aurea' of 1479, the date is difficult to accept, but nevertheless requires explanation.

The manuscript date, 1472, in the 'Pastorale of S. Gregory,' printed by Martin Flach at Basel, is equally interesting and less troublesome, as though this takes Flach back two years, the book (previously dated 'not after 1474' from the rubricator's note in the copy at Bodley) is in the earlier form of his first type, and there is no difficulty in accepting 1472 as the date of its production. It is by contemporary notes such as this, painfully gathered from libraries all over Europe, that bibliographers are getting gradually at the facts and dates which so many early printers, more especially those of Strassburg and Basel, studiously withheld, and in this, as in all other respects, M. Polain's new volume is a noteworthy contribution to knowledge.

*Geofroy Tory: Painter and Engraver: First Royal Printer: Reformer of Orthography and Typography under François I. An account of his life and works, by Auguste Bernard. Translated by G. B. Ives. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass. London, Archibald Constable & Co.*

In the first number of 'Bibliographica,' the present writer remarked how pleasant it would be to possess a new edition of Auguste Bernard's



monograph on Geoffroi Tory, 'worthily illustrated' by the modern methods of reproduction which were unknown when Bernard brought out his revised edition in 1865. After fifteen years the pleasant book has actually been produced, not as a new edition of the French original, but as a very carefully executed English translation from the pen of Mr. G. B. Ives. Auguste Bernard had died long before 'Bibliographica' was thought of, so that no further edition could be looked for from the author himself, a matter for sincere regret, as it would have been interesting to know if he ever modified his opinions on such points as the identity of Geoffroi Tory with the painter Godefroi, or the extent to which he should be made responsible for the numerous and very miscellaneous wood-blocks which bear the mark of the cross of Lorraine. Mr. Ives has added some useful notes to his version, but his aim has been to produce a faithful translation, not a new revision, so that the book, good as it is, has some of the drawbacks which are to be expected in a work now about forty years old. Artistically and typographically, on the other hand, it has no need to ask for any indulgence, for the illustrations of Tory's work are numerous and wonderfully delicate, and the type, presswork, arrangement of the pages, and other externals, are each excellent in themselves, and combined with the skill and taste which mark all the work produced under the superintendence of Mr. Bruce Rogers at the Riverside Press. Despite some faults Tory fully deserves the care which has here been lavished on him. His ornament is at times thin

and less decorative than the best fifteenth century work, but he is always graceful, and his pictorial cuts have a subtle and dignified charm peculiarly their own. His is by far the finest bookwork of the French Renaissance, and in this handsome edition of Bernard's monograph full justice is at last done to it.

*Index to 'Book-Prices Current' for the second decade, 1897 to 1906. By William Jaggard. Elliot Stock.*

The first of Mr. Jaggard's decennial indexes to Book-Prices Current has proved abundantly useful, and its new and much larger successor is certain to be equally appreciated. To our great regret special references to books notable for their binding, fine printing, etc., have had to be omitted on account of the cost, and the Index has thus to be judged as mainly one of authors. From this point of view it is all that could be desired; clearly printed and well-arranged, and with information as to personal names and the real authorship of anonymous and pseudonymous books liberally supplied. The quiet satisfaction with which a good index to a useful book is placed on the book-shelf is the real measure of its value, and it is not easy to translate this into words which shall at all adequately recognize the immense amount of laborious and tedious work which must have been undergone in its production. Besides its main usefulness as a key, an index of of this kind possesses a subsidiary value for the evidence which it offers as to the comparative frequency with which different books come into

the market. Thus we learn from Mr. Jaggard's references that during the decade with which it deals 31 copies of the First Folio Shakespeare came up for sale, 70 of the Second (57 with the Allot imprint, 11 with the Smethwick, 4 with the Hawkins, 1 with the Meighen), 31 of the Third (25 dated 1664, and 6 dated 1663), and 66 of the Fourth (2 Herringman and Knight, the rest Herringman and Brewster). Thus as far as the evidence of these ten years carries us, the Third is exactly as rare as the First, while the Second and Fourth are rather more than twice as common. Of Milton's 'Paradise Lost' 14 copies were sold with title-pages dated 1667 (Mr. Jaggard does not further distinguish the issues), 24 dated 1668, and 49 dated 1669, the inference being that the poem grew steadily in favour, though it is open to anyone to imagine that the earliest copies were thumbed to pieces by eager readers or are all in public libraries. Of the 'Hypnerotomachia Poliphili' 35 sales are recorded, of the Nuremberg Chronicle 44, the high numbers offering ample reason for the comparatively small prices which these two fine books generally fetch unless in exceptionally fine condition. Both totals, however, were exceeded by the 61 copies sold of the Kelmscott Chaucer, of which also the selling value is kept down by the number of copies on the market. Presumably these books will one day become difficult to obtain, from the gradual absorption of copies by public libraries; but rare, thanks to the zeal of collectors in the past, they can never be.

A. W. P.

s  
it  
e  
ot  
e  
d  
of  
st  
e  
is  
d  
i.  
d  
ot  
d  
n  
-  
d  
c,  
e  
e  
e  
e  
d  
f  
e  
y  
c  
s